

लाल बहादुर शास्त्री प्रशासन अकादमी  
Lal Bahadur Shastri Academy  
of Administration  
मसूरी

MUSSOORIE

पुस्तकालय

LIBRARY

अवाप्ति मख्या

Accession No

~~4258~~

106302

वर्ग संख्या

Class No

335.4

पुस्तक संख्या

Book No

Leo

**M A R X ' S    *C A P I T A L***

*Other books by the same author*

POLITICAL ECONOMY—A TEXTBOOK

WORK UNDER CAPITALISM AND SOCIALISM

A LEONTIEV

# Marx's *Capital*



INTERNATIONAL PUBLISHERS

NEW YORK

COPYRIGHT, 1946, BY  
INTERNATIONAL PUBLISHERS CO , INC



209

PRINTED IN U S A

## CONTENTS

I	THE SIGNIFICANCE OF MARX'S <i>CAPITAL</i>	7
II	A GENERAL CHARACTERIZATION OF <i>CAPITAL</i>	30
	1 The Structural Plan of <i>Capital</i>	31
	2 How the Exposition Is Tied Together Internally	40
	3 The Literary Form of <i>Capital</i>	54
III	PRINCIPAL MILESTONES IN MARX'S WORK ON <i>CAPITAL</i>	77
	1 The 1840's	79
	2 From the Revolution of 1848 to the Publication of the <i>Critique of Political Economy</i>	84
	3 The First Volume of <i>Capital</i>	101
	4 After the Publication of the First Volume	114
	5 Engels' Work on <i>Capital</i>	134
	<i>Reference Notes</i>	145

## N O T E

The following essay on Marx's *Capital*, written by A. Leontiev, outstanding Soviet economist, was published in 1945, prior to the victorious conclusion of the war against fascist Germany. Hence, several allusions by the author to the nature of the war and the aims of the Soviet Union in that war.

The translation from the Russian was made by Emily G. Kazakévich.

## CHAPTER I

### The Significance of Marx's *Capital*

IN epochs of gigantic battles which decide the destinies of many generations, it is with special feeling that contemporary thought turns to the great creations of human genius. From creations embodying the mighty, invincible power of the human mind and heart new strength is drawn by those struggling against the dark bearers of reaction and oppression who strive to turn the wheel of history backward.

The struggle now being waged by the freedom-loving peoples of the world against the brown plague of Hitlerism transcends in its importance, scope, and consequences the most grandiose wars of past epochs. In the present war the peoples of the democratic countries are fighting for their lives and for freedom. At stake in this war is the existence of values created by centuries of hard, self-sacrificing struggle on the part of countless generations, at stake is the further destiny of mankind—whether it is to be free or to fall into the utter darkness of slavery. The Hitlerite bandits, under the banner of blackest reaction, extreme obscurantism, and bestial hatred of humanity, have tried to achieve their cannibalistic program of enslavement and destruction of whole peoples.

The German-fascist cannibals plunged the world into the abyss of a devastating and bloody war with the aim of achieving their own wild and insane plans to win mastery over Europe and



the whole world. They set themselves the goal of annihilating the great conquests of the October Socialist Revolution in our country and eradicating the democratic rights won through long struggle by the toiling masses of the civilized countries.

The German-fascist scoundrels have drenched the continent of Europe in a sea of blood and tears. In countries and regions occupied by the Germans a bloody regime of robbery and banditry, of lawlessness and intolerable oppression, has been established. The monstrous crimes and atrocities of the German invaders leave the darkest pages of history far behind. Fascist Germany set itself the insane task of drowning millions of people in their own blood in order to transform tens of millions into labor cattle in the service of German bandit-plutocrats. The German-fascist scoundrels have raised the knife against all that mankind holds dear—freedom, culture, progress, and the striving for a better and happy life.

If mankind is to live on the earth, breathe the air, make use of the fruits of its labors, fight for progress, and make advances, Hitlerism must be swept from the face of the earth, the brown filth must be destroyed. Thus, and only thus, is history posing the problem. This problem is being solved in the titanic struggle against a treacherous and crafty foe, which is being conducted by the peoples of the Soviet Union in fighting partnership with the peoples of England, the United States, and other democratic countries.

In this war of the Soviet Union—the most just and progressive of all the wars known to history—our people are armed by steel faith in the triumph of a just cause. In this war for the freedom, honor, and life of our motherland, the Soviet people rely not only on the might of their arms on the battlefield, but also on an inflexible strength of spirit. Marxist-Leninist theory, tested in battle, arms the Soviet people with knowledge of the laws of social development, including knowledge of the laws of war. Based on scientific generalization of the vast experience of the whole history of mankind, this theory shows that people's

destinies are determined by the active struggle of the popular masses themselves, that on their resoluteness and will, their heroism and sacrifice, their maturity and consciousness, the outcome of the struggle depends

Marxist-Leninist science serves as a guiding thread, helping to find the way in the complex labyrinth of social relationships of our epoch. Events of exceptional importance are unfolding with unparalleled rapidity. The immortal teaching of Marx, Engels, Lenin, and Stalin makes possible a faultless orientation in the motley alternation of events in international life, in the rapidly changing phenomena of war. The living, creative Marxism-Leninism, capable of development and ceaselessly developing, which is embodied in the words of Comrade Stalin, is a brilliant searchlight illuminating the path of struggle and victory.

In order to grasp in full measure the strength of our spiritual armament, we turn our thoughts to the bases of Marxist theory, to the cornerstones of its foundation. This foundation was laid many decades ago by Marx in his immortal work, *Capital*.

In *Capital* Marx gave the deepest and most many-sided proof and elaboration of his great discoveries, which brought about a complete revolution in views on human society and the paths of its development. By this is meant the great discoveries that put socialism on a firm scientific foundation and showed that socialism is the necessary and logical result of the whole course of development of civilization. Socialist ideas were known long before the founders of scientific socialism, Marx and Engels, stepped into the arena of social struggle. Indeed, in the pre-Marxist period there were socialist "systems" of all possible varieties in such quantities as never existed after the appearance of Marxism. But this socialism was far from the real course of history.

Socialism remained a utopia. The socialist order was described in colors that were more or less attractive, depending on the talent of the composer. And among the utopians there were

brilliantly gifted people, such as Thomas More and Campanella, Robert Owen, Saint-Simon, and Fourier. But between the ideal of the utopians and the real world there was a yawning chasm. Marx and Engels proved scientifically the inevitability of the victory of communism in the course of the progressive development of human society. In the real world they found that force which was summoned by history to step forth as the revolutionary creator of a socialist order. Thanks to this, socialism ceased being a utopia and became a science.

With classic clarity and precision the *History of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union* has characterized the great discoveries of Marx and Engels that transformed socialism from a utopia into a science.

"Marx and Engels, the great teachers of the proletariat, were the first to explain that, contrary to the opinion of the utopian Socialists, socialism was not the invention of dreamers (utopians), but the inevitable outcome of the development of modern capitalist society. They showed that the capitalist system would fall, just as serfdom had fallen, and that capitalism was creating its own gravediggers in the person of the proletariat. They showed that only the class struggle of the proletariat, only the victory of the proletariat over the bourgeoisie, would rid humanity of capitalism and exploitation.

"Marx and Engels taught the proletariat to be conscious of its own strength, to be conscious of its class interests and to unite for a determined struggle against the bourgeoisie. Marx and Engels discovered the laws of development of capitalist society and proved scientifically that the development of capitalist society, and the class struggle going on within it, must inevitably lead to the fall of capitalism, to the victory of the proletariat, to the *dictatorship of the proletariat*.

"Marx and Engels taught that it was impossible to get rid of the power of capital and to convert capitalist property into public property by peaceful means, and that the working class could achieve this only by revolutionary violence against the bour-

geoisie, by a *proletarian revolution*, by establishing its own political rule—the dictatorship of the proletariat—which must crush the resistance of the exploiters and create a new, classless, Communist society

“Marx and Engels taught that the industrial proletariat is the most revolutionary and therefore the most advanced class in capitalist society, and that only a class like the proletariat could rally around itself all the forces discontented with capitalism and lead them in the storming of capitalism. But in order to vanquish the old world and create a new, classless society, the proletariat must have its own working-class party, which Marx and Engels called the Communist Party”<sup>1</sup>

The teaching of Marx and Engels, by which socialism was for the first time firmly implanted and which transformed it from a utopia into a science, finds its fullest expression in *Capital*

What is the essence of the great discoveries through which Marxism brought about a complete revolution in the whole science of human society? Engels distinguishes two of these discoveries as having first-rank importance. the materialist conception of history and the theory of surplus value<sup>2</sup> Both these discoveries were elaborated by Marx in *Capital* with greatest perfection, depth, clarity, and consistency

Marxism brought about a profound revolution in the whole conception of world history. For thousands of years men had been powerless to explain the laws by which society develops. The history of society appeared to them as the result of the arbitrariness or whim of individual “heroes,” as a continuous chain of accidents, destitute of any logical connection.

Marx discovered that society, like nature, develops according to specific laws. However, unlike the laws of nature, the laws of development of human society are manifested, not apart from the will and actions of people, but on the contrary, precisely through the actions of enormous masses of people. Marxism showed that the peoples themselves forge their own well-being and freedom. The development of mankind proceeds from

lower to higher forms of society, and attempts to hold this progressive course in check, or turn it back, are doomed to ultimate failure, no matter to what bloody sacrifices they lead. Marxism revealed that the development of capitalism, by virtue of the internal contradictions inherent in this social order, leads to the victory of the socialist revolution, to the establishment of the proletarian dictatorship. Marxism teaches that the downfall of capitalism does not come about by itself, but only as a result of hard struggle by the proletariat, personifying the interests of social progress, against the reactionary class forces, representing the yesterday of mankind.

The laws of social development blaze their trail by means of the class struggle that goes on in society. Men remained pitiful toys of the blind chaos of historical development until they learned to see through the motley fabric of social phenomena to the motivating force behind it—the struggle of classes occupying different positions in a specific system of social production. Marx pointed out that the credit for the discovery of classes did not belong to him; their existence was known even earlier. But it was the creators of scientific communism who laid bare the deep foundations of the class struggle in specific socio-economic formations, explained the laws of origin, development, and downfall of the different forms of exploitative society, disclosed the actual tendency of the class struggle in capitalist society, and made the brilliant prediction that the goal and triumph of this struggle would be the dictatorship of the working class, leading to the construction of a socialist society and the abolition of classes. Thus the progressive struggle of huge masses of people was for the first time provided with an engrossing, profoundly conscious objective, one that was real and not illusory. Thus humanity, in the person of its advanced class, was given the true slogan of struggle. The task—to change the actual world—was for the first time supported by a precise knowledge of the laws of social development.

Marx laid the basis for a scientific approach to the phenomena

of human society Capitalism existed before Marx But a scientific understanding of the capitalist mode of production, its motivating contradictions, and the laws operating in it was achieved for the first time by Marx In 1899, in his explanation of the draft program of our party, Lenin outlined the essence of Marx's teaching, in Lenin's words, Marx's theory " was the first to transform socialism from a utopia to a science, to fix the firm foundation of this science and to indicate the path along which it is necessary to proceed, while developing this science further and elaborating it in every detail It laid bare the essence of modern capitalist economy, explaining the manner in which the hire of the laborer, the purchase of labor-power, masks the enslavement of millions of propertyless people by a handful of capitalists, the owners of the land, factories, mines, etc It showed that the whole trend of development of modern capitalism is towards the ousting of small production by large, and the creating of conditions which make a socialist system of society possible and inevitable It taught us to see under the veil of rooted customs, political intrigues, subtle laws and artful doctrines, the *class struggle*, the struggle between all species of propertied classes and the mass of non-possessors, *the proletariat*, which stands at the head of all the propertyless It made clear the real task of a revolutionary socialist party it is neither drawing up plans for the reconstruction of society, nor preaching sermons to the capitalists and their hangers-on about improving the lot of the workers, nor making conspiracies, *but the organization of the class struggle of the proletariat and the leadership of this struggle, the final aim of which is the winning of political power by the proletariat and the organization of a socialist society* " <sup>3</sup>

Lenin more than once indicated that "the consistent extension of materialism to the domain of social phenomena" <sup>4</sup> means a deepening and development of materialism Lenin called the historical materialism of Marx "one of the greatest achievements of scientific thought " With unsurpassed clarity and sharpness

of outline he described the content of this great achievement of scientific thought

"The chaos and arbitrariness that had previously reigned in the views on history and politics gave way to a strikingly integral and harmonious scientific theory, which shows how, in consequence of the growth of productive forces, out of one system of social life another and higher system develops—how capitalism, for instance, grows out of feudalism " <sup>5</sup>

The close, indissoluble bond between Marxian political economy and historical materialism stands out in sharp relief in this passage

*Capital* is a work that marks an epoch in the history of mankind. In this work a durable foundation was laid for the understanding of human society and the laws of its development on the basis of the only existing scientific method—materialist dialectics. Having grown out of the vital needs of the proletariat, from the day of its publication right down to the present, *Capital* has been one of the sharpest weapons of the working class in its struggle for socialism. Many generations of proletarian revolutionaries in all countries have turned and still turn to *Capital* as to a primary source of the theory which has long since become a material force gripping the masses. In it they find a brilliant generalization of the practical experience of the working class and its struggle.

From the day of its birth this work has ceaselessly armed warriors waging the greatest world-historic battles. For *Capital* is devoted to the most profound elaboration and proof of that theory which "combines a strict and supreme scientific spirit (representing as it does the last word in social science) with a revolutionary spirit, and combines them not by chance, not only because the founder of the doctrine combined in his person the qualities of a man of learning and a revolutionary, but does so intrinsically and inseparably within the theory itself " <sup>6</sup>

This intrinsic and inseparable bond between strict and supreme scientific spirit and revolutionary spirit marks *Capital* as

a powerful weapon in the arsenal of the workers' struggle for socialism. This book is a wellspring for that world outlook, integrated and all-conquering, which strengthens tenfold the champions of social progress.

"As long as there have been capitalists and workers on earth, no book has appeared which is of as much importance for the workers as the one before us."<sup>7</sup> These words open Engels' review of the first volume of *Capital*. Engels speaks here of the working class as the social force that personifies the tomorrow of mankind, its best hopes and proudest thoughts, as the class that enters the arena of historical action under the banner of a scientific understanding of the laws of social development.

*Capital* is, in the full meaning of the word, an encyclopedic work. A brilliant embodiment of Marx's method, it reflects the extraordinary breadth of scientific interests of its author, who had skillfully mastered the most varied branches of knowledge. Lenin emphasized that *Capital* is the "prime and basic work expounding scientific socialism."<sup>8</sup>

Marx's method—revolutionary materialist dialectics—is most fully elaborated and applied in *Capital*, which is one of the greatest philosophic, as well as economic, works. "If Marx did not leave us a *Logic* (with a capital letter), he did leave us the *logic* of *Capital*." In *Capital* he applied to a single study logic, dialectics, and the theory of knowledge of materialism (not necessary to use three terms—it's one and the same thing), taking from Hegel all that was valuable and advancing said valuable further."<sup>9</sup> At one stage in his work on *Capital* Marx thought of outlining briefly, in a form "accessible to the ordinary human intelligence—what is *rational* in the method which Hegel discovered but at the same time enveloped in mysticism."<sup>10</sup> Marx never got around to realizing this objective, but in *Capital*, dialectics, which Hegel had standing on its head, is placed firmly on its feet.

"My dialectic method is not only different from the Hegelian, but is its direct opposite,"<sup>11</sup> wrote Marx in the postscript to



the second edition of *Capital*, Volume I From the first page to the last this work shows how false are the reactionary attempts to identify Marx's dialectics with Hegel's and obscure the fundamental, decisive difference between the idealist dialectics of Hegel, which addresses itself to the past and is one form of the bourgeois world outlook, and the revolutionary materialist dialectics of Marx and Engels, which addresses itself to the present and the future and is the world outlook of the proletariat "As a matter of fact, Marx and Engels took from the Hegelian dialectics only its 'rational kernel,' casting aside its idealistic shell, and developed it further so as to lend it a modern scientific form " <sup>12</sup> This tremendous task was carried out by Marx primarily in *Capital* The materialist dialectics applied in *Capital* "is a scandal and abomination to bourgeoisdom and its doctrinaire professors, because it lets nothing impose upon it, and is in its essence critical and revolutionary " <sup>13</sup>

*Capital* is an unsurpassed model of the elaboration and application of materialist dialectics as the theory of the laws of motion of nature, society, and thought In applying materialist dialectics to the study of society Marx discovered the basic law determining the movement and development of human history In *Capital* Marx reveals the course of development of socio-economic formations as a natural-historical process " with Marx the dialectics of bourgeois society is only a particular case of dialectics " <sup>14</sup> In his investigation of capitalism Marx penetrated deep into the essence of things, uncovering the most secret internal springs of social development

*Capital* is devoted primarily to the elaboration of Marx's economic doctrine, which is "the most profound, comprehensive and detailed confirmation and application of Marx's theory " <sup>15</sup> With the aim of revealing the economic law of motion of capitalist society, Marx in his basic work exhibited "the whole capitalist social formation as a live thing—with its everyday aspects, with the actual social manifestation of the antagonism of classes inherent in the relations of production, with the

bourgeois political superstructure which preserves the domination of the capitalist class, with the bourgeois ideas of liberty, equality, and so forth, with the bourgeois family relations”<sup>16</sup>

As is known, Marx had a very low opinion of the kind of science that builds castles in the air. The structure of scientific communism was erected by Marx and Engels according to a different method. The creators of Marxism critically reworked everything of value that had been brought to life by many centuries of cultural development. They fashioned their own theory as the direct and immediate continuation of the greatest achievements of all preceding history by the most eminent representatives of philosophy, political economy, and socialism. Lenin emphasized that Marxism least of all resembled sectarian dogma born somewhere away from the highroad of world cultural development. “On the contrary the genius of Marx consists precisely in the fact that he furnished answers to questions which had already engrossed the foremost minds of humanity”<sup>17</sup>

The founders of scientific communism came forward as the lawful heirs to all that was best in the heritage of humanity’s past. And this world outlook, hammered out by masters on the anvil of the most valuable achievements of the human mind and heart, is what the Hitlerite obscurantists want to destroy, in favor of the cannibalistic “theories” concocted by them out of the most repulsive leavings of reactionary ideologies, dug up in the rubbish heaps and refuse pits of history. Ten years ago, in his report to the Seventeenth Party Congress, Comrade Stalin said:

“It is said that in some countries in the West Marxism has already been destroyed. It is said that it has been destroyed by the bourgeois-nationalist trend known as fascism. That is nonsense, of course. Only people who are ignorant of history can say such things. Marxism is the scientific expression of the fundamental interests of the working class. If Marxism is to be destroyed, the working class must be destroyed. And it is impossible to destroy the working class. More than eighty years

have passed since Marxism came into the arena. During this time scores and hundreds of bourgeois governments have tried to destroy Marxism. But what has been the upshot? Bourgeois governments have come and gone, but Marxism still goes on.”<sup>18</sup>

Marxism-Leninism is the fighting theory of the working class. Only the proletariat—the class to which the future belongs—can fearlessly disclose the laws of social development. For these laws confirm the necessity of the victory of the proletariat.

At the dawn of capitalism the bourgeoisie was a young class, full of strength and energy. It struggled resolutely against the feudal order, which had grown senile. Its men of learning sincerely tried to penetrate with their vision the secrets of the development of human society. They did see and take note of a good deal that was valuable in this field. But they were prevented from uncovering the actual laws of social development by their class limitations. They were unable to make the discovery that the social development that was bringing the bourgeoisie to power would later lead to its downfall. They considered the bourgeois order the eternal and natural social order.

The exponents of bourgeois classical economy (especially the greatest of them, Ricardo), by their conscientious investigation of various aspects of the capitalist mode of production, contributed much that was valuable. In characterizing the “theoretical acuteness” with which Ricardo investigated the phenomena of bourgeois economics, Marx quotes from a contemporary: “Mr Ricardo seemed as if he had dropped from another planet.”<sup>19</sup>

These economists accepted the bourgeois order as given and did not ask themselves how it arose. While investigating the production relations under which people produce commodities, they did not even pose the question as to how these very production relations arise. The classical economists started by assuming the eternal, absolute, unchanging character of the bourgeois

mode of production. They did not see that it had a beginning and an end. The representatives of the bourgeois classical school naively considered capitalism to be the natural condition of human society—they could not see beyond the limits of the bourgeois horizon. The ideologists of the young, rising bourgeoisie fearlessly pointed out the contradictions of capitalism, without resorting to conscious embroidery of capitalist reality, as their pitiful successors in the camp of vulgar political economy came to do. But at the same time they could not free themselves from the blinkers of bourgeois ideology.

Bourgeois classical economy was the child of the eighteenth century. It was closely linked to the Enlightenment of the age of preparation for the classical bourgeois revolution in France. The classical economists continued the rationalism of the French Enlightenment, with all its merits and defects. As Engels pointed out, "To them, the new science was not the expression of the conditions and requirements of their epoch, but the expression of eternal Reason."<sup>20</sup> In the field of explaining history they adhered to various idealist systems. The rationalistic theory of natural law enjoyed unquestioned authority among them.

The classical economists looked upon the bourgeois society of their day as the natural form of human society in general. They deduced its laws from the nature of man and considered these laws to be the eternal, unchanging laws of every society in general.

From this point of view, everything that existed before capitalism was of no interest for the science. For in those times men, out of their own ignorance, broke the laws of nature, which find their adequate embodiment only in a world of healthy self-interest and free competition. Marx spoke with caustic irony of the bourgeois economists who treat pre-capitalist economic formations of society the same way the Christian church treats all non-Christian religions. They "blot out all

historical differences and see the bourgeois form in all forms of society”<sup>21</sup>

And although the best of the classics—especially Ricardo—at times had inklings of the limits of capitalist production and suspected that the bourgeois order was not eternal, nevertheless class limitations prevented them from defining the actual historical place of capitalism

The classical economists sometimes analyzed the contradictions of capitalism with genuine scientific courage. But the dialectics of these contradictions, the tendency of their development, remained for the classics a book sealed with seven seals. The utopian criticism of capitalism on the part of the petty bourgeois economists (Sismondı) and the early socialists also failed to disclose the actual mainsprings of development of the capitalist order

As it turned out, only Marx was equal to this task. He revolutionized political economy, approaching it as a representative of the working class. The capitalist order itself now stood forth, not as the social embodiment of the basic principles of human nature, but as a specific stage of social development, one of the steps in the great ladder of historical progress. From the depths of past centuries its origins clearly emerged, and the outlines of its end were sketched far in the future.

Capitalist production relations had been taken by the economists of the classical school for production relations in general. Of Ricardo, Marx remarked that the fantastic schemes of the utopian socialist Owen were “the only form of society outside of the bourgeois form with which he was acquainted”<sup>22</sup>. Hence Marx’s predecessors were unable to reveal the specific character of the capitalist mode of production as a mode of production of a special kind, were unable to disclose its laws of motion and development. Hence they would halt helplessly before the hopeless contradictions which criticism revealed in their theoretical systems.

Only Marx and Engels were able to disclose the actual laws

of motion of capitalism "The great and historic merit of Marx and Engels is that they proved by scientific analysis the inevitability of the collapse of capitalism and its transition to communism, under which there will be no more exploitation of man by man" <sup>23</sup> To reveal the capitalist mode of production means to discover the laws of movement and downfall of capitalism, to disclose the movement of its contradictions, to define its place in history This is what Marx did

The victory of the bourgeoisie over the feudal lords marked an enormous step forward along the road of social progress By their crooked embellishment of medieval feudal relations, extolling the medieval hierarchy, the relationship of overlord to underling, personal bondage of the toiling masses, by setting up medieval obscurantism against modern culture, the fascists exposed their own frantic reactionism However, the transition from feudalism to capitalism did not put an end to exploitation, but only marked the substitution of one form of exploitation for another As the capitalist mode of production developed, this became continually clearer, and as ever new masses of toilers fell under the yoke of capitalist exploitation, the working masses joined forces in the struggle for their own liberation

"It [the developing class struggle—Tr ] sounded the knell of scientific bourgeois economy It was thenceforth no longer a question, whether this theorem or that was true, but whether it was useful to capital or harmful, expedient or inexpedient, politically dangerous or not In place of disinterested enquirers, there were hired prize-fighters, in place of genuine scientific research, the bad conscience and the evil intent of apologetic" <sup>24</sup>

A most powerful weapon of the working class in its struggle for liberation from the chains of capitalist slavery is revolutionary theory After Marxism had arrived on the scene, the basic assignment of the bourgeois "science" became the struggle against this theory

Hence Lenin wrote that "after Marx, to talk about any

other, non-Marxist political economy is possible only for purposes of duping the philistines " <sup>25</sup>

When Marx entered the arena of social-political action, capitalism had passed the season of its blossoming. The youthful bourgeoisie, full of power and energy, was already reveling in the first fruits of its victories. The peddlers of bourgeois ideas were triumphantly announcing the approach of the millennium of the innate rights of man. The gaping contradictions of the capitalist order, its clearly visible ulcers, could not shake the confident belief of the ruling class that "all is for the best in the best of worlds." Some bourgeois spokesmen cynically declared that the miseries of the broad popular masses were the natural consequence of the imperfection of human nature, others helplessly appealed to ideas of right and justice. The bourgeoisie was frightened neither by utopian socialism, which addressed itself to the rich and made appeals to their sentiments, or built castles in the air, nor by impotent petty bourgeois criticism, which preached a return to the past.

Marx came forward as ideologist and leader of a new class, whose origin and growth accompanied the origin and growth of the capitalist mode of production. The proletariat is as much the offspring of capitalism as is the bourgeoisie. The working class comes on the historical scene right behind the bourgeoisie, but from the very start its arrival carries concealed in it a threat to the very existence of the system of exploitation.

The proletariat is a class interested in the fullest, deepest, and truest understanding of the laws of social development and the actual course of history. For this is a class whose interests wholly and fully correspond with genuine social progress, a class that fights consistently and to the end under the banner of progress and rallies round itself all progressive forces in society, a class that does not fear the future, but looks at it boldly in the face.

As long ago as the nineties of the last century Lenin wrote that *Capital* is "the greatest work on political economy of our age" <sup>26</sup> This work has the subtitle "A Critique of Political

Economy" In it is given a well-developed critique of all preceding political economy, in which are disclosed the inadequacy of analysis, the errors and unsolved contradictions, before which the greatest of Marx's predecessors, the economists of the classical school, halted helplessly, the evasions and platitudes of the apologists for capitalism, the "learned" lackeys of reaction and obscurantism In *Capital* Marx gives an unsurpassed analysis of the "basis of capitalism,"<sup>27</sup> a "model scientific analysis, in accordance with the materialist method, of one—the most complex—of the social formations" <sup>28</sup> On the basis of a huge mass of factual material Marx discloses the laws of origin, development, and downfall of bourgeois society and shows the necessity of the victory of the proletarian socialist revolution

Marx was the first to disclose the historically limited nature of the capitalist mode of production He showed that capitalism is not at all the eternal, natural, absolute condition of human society, but, on the contrary, is only a specific, historically limited form of it Marx disclosed the historical mission of capitalism He showed how bourgeois society rouses to life the mighty productive forces of social labor and thus creates the material base for a new and higher form of society At the same time the bourgeois order gives birth to that social force—the proletariat—which, by its revolutionary struggle, strives to attain the realization of socialism Capitalism itself creates its own gravedigger The material preconditions of socialism arise in the womb of capitalist society in an extremely antagonistic and contradictory form Only the victorious socialist revolution of the proletariat, asserting its own revolutionary dictatorship, can liberate the gigantic productive forces that have grown up within the framework of capitalism from those fetters into which the production relations of capitalism are transforming themselves The doctrine of the dictatorship of the working class as the only path to socialism Lenin called *the principal doctrine of Marxism*<sup>29</sup>

*Capital* is a very great historical study, illuminating with a



bright light the historical path of capitalism from its beginning to its end

Marx puts the most burning problems of social development on a "historical footing, not only in the sense of explaining the past, but also in the sense of a fearless forecast of the future and of bold practical action for its achievement" <sup>30</sup> The whole of *Capital* is shot through with a genuine historicism precisely in this sense, containing in itself the indissoluble bond between theory and practice "We do not say to it" (the world) "stop fighting, all your struggle is nonsense We will provide you with the true slogan of the struggle" <sup>31</sup> These words of Marx, written in his youth, found their fullest embodiment in *Capital*

The great invincible strength of Marxism-Leninism lies in its historical integrity, its exceptional veracity As Lenin wrote, "the Marxian doctrine is omnipotent because it is true" <sup>32</sup> Marxism-Leninism is the only teaching on human society which is not afraid to look truth in the eyes in a bold and straight-forward fashion, which by its very nature is the uncompromising enemy of any kind of falsification of historical reality Lenin emphasized that "historical materialism and Marx's entire economic doctrine are permeated through and through by a recognition of objective truth" <sup>33</sup>

The enormous significance of the extension of the method of revolutionary materialist dialectics to the sphere of social phenomena is clearly shown in the *History of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union*

"If there are no isolated phenomena in the world, if all phenomena are interconnected and interdependent, then it is clear that every social system and every social movement in history must be evaluated not from the standpoint of 'eternal justice' or some other preconceived idea, as is not infrequently done by historians, but from the standpoint of the conditions which gave rise to that system or that social movement and with which they are connected" <sup>34</sup>

But the recognition of objective truth does not at all mean

so-called objectivism Lenin more than once emphasized that this objectivism is the worst enemy of Marxism, since Marxism is a *partisan* science Thus, in pointing out that bourgeois "professors of economics are nothing but scientific salesmen of the capitalist class," he wrote " *not a single* professor of political economy, who may be capable of very valuable contributions in the field of factual and specialized investigations, can be trusted *one iota* when it comes to the general theory of political economy For in modern society the latter is as much a *partisan* science as is *epistemology* " <sup>35</sup>

With exceptional force and clarity Lenin exposed the essence of the notorious "objectivism" and showed at the same time the whole significance of partisanship in science

Marxism-Leninism is more consistent than so-called objectivism, it is deeper, fuller, more thoroughgoing, and incomparably closer to objective truth, for it has partisanship, which obliges one, in the evaluation of every social phenomenon, to take one's stand frankly and directly on the side of the revolutionary class to whom the future belongs Thus it turns out that the notorious "objectivism," in its endeavor to flee from partisanship and discard the standpoint of the proletariat, in fact leads inevitably to the falsification of the real world

An impassable gulf separates Marxism-Leninism—this partisan ideology, partisan world outlook, partisan science of the working class—from any kind of subjectivism Subjectivism, denying objective truth, gives free rein to the arbitrary It can serve as compass neither for comprehension of the real world nor for its revolutionary transformation In practice subjectivism shuts off the path to the comprehension of the laws of economic development of society

Marxism-Leninism teaches that the role of various social phenomena changes as the historical context changes During his struggle with the opportunists, who in the period of transition to the New Economic Policy paraded their "left" phrases, Lenin more than once stressed that capitalism is an evil com-

pared with socialism, but that it is a good compared with primitive backwardness, savagery, patriarchalism, and so forth<sup>36</sup>

In the *History of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union* the example is cited of the demand for a bourgeois-democratic republic this demand was timely, understandable, and revolutionary under the conditions of tsarist Russia, but it is counter-revolutionary and meaningless under the conditions of the U S S R Thus, "everything depends on the conditions, time and place"<sup>37</sup>

The truth and profundity of this statement are revealed especially clearly in today's context of titanic struggle by freedom-loving mankind against the Hitlerite plague The Hitlerite bandits, these watchdogs of German plutocracy, set for themselves the criminal goal of plunging mankind into the darkness of the most savage slavery, lawlessness, oppression, and complete cultural retrogression to barbarism Hitlerite Germany and its accomplices are furthering the black cause of banditry and crime The opponents of Hitlerism, the members of the coalition of freedom-loving powers engaged in the struggle against Hitlerism, are waging a just war of liberation

Partisanship requires adopting the position of the class personifying social progress, for only this position ensures a real comprehension of objective truth That is why Marx's *Capital*, in its inexhaustible depth and crystalline scientific conscientiousness, is one of the most stirring books that ever left the pen of man

How different is Marx's absorbing account from the listless compositions of the reactionary doctrinaires! What passion, for instance, breathes in the pages of *Capital* dealing with the history of so-called primitive accumulation, the expropriation of the peasants from the land, the merciless reckoning with the expropriated! How stirring the pages in *Capital* unfolding the picture of the struggle over the working day, the picture of the first attempts by the working class to win even faintly human conditions of existence! With what murderous sarcasm Marx

hits out at the apologists of capitalism, its hired scribes and attorneys earning their bread from their bosses at the price of conscienceless embellishment of murky reality, at the price of lies and distortion!

Only Marxism-Leninism gives a person the integrated and articulate world outlook in which complete harmony of thought and feeling is attained. The recognition of objective truth not only does not hinder, but, on the contrary, rouses one to struggle passionately and resolutely for a better future for mankind. Lenin beautifully characterized one of the most important qualities of Marx's *Capital* in the following words: "The famous treatise on 'Capital' is justly considered one of the most remarkable models of implacable objectivity in the investigation of social phenomena. A whole series of scholars and economists have seen, precisely in its implacable objectivity, the chief and basic shortcoming of this treatise. And yet in few scientific treatises will you find so much 'heart,' so many burning and passionate polemical outbursts against representatives of backward views, against representatives of those social classes which, the author is convinced, are a brake on social development." <sup>38</sup>

*Capital*, written in the epoch of pre-monopolistic capitalism, provided an exhaustive investigation into the general laws of capitalism. In place of the epoch of free competition came a new and higher stage of capitalism—imperialism, which "emerged as the development and direct continuation of the fundamental attributes of capitalism in general." <sup>39</sup>

Under the conditions of the new historical epoch—the epoch of imperialism and proletarian revolution—the teaching of Marx and Engels was raised to a new and higher level by Lenin and Stalin.

To quote from the *History of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union*:

"It may be said without fear of exaggeration that since the death of Engels the master theoretician Lenin, and after Lenin, Stalin and the other disciples of Lenin, have been the only

Marxists who have advanced the Marxist theory and who have enriched it with new experience in the new conditions of the class struggle of the proletariat

"And just because Lenin and the Leninists have advanced the Marxist theory, Leninism is a further development of Marxism, it is Marxism in the new conditions of the class struggle of the proletariat, Marxism of the epoch of imperialism and proletarian revolutions, Marxism of the epoch of the victory of socialism on one-sixth of the earth's surface" <sup>40</sup>

In a series of brilliant works Lenin investigated the new phenomena in the development of capitalism in all their aspects, revealing the tendencies of the new imperialist stage of capitalism from the point of view of the working class engaged in the struggle for socialism. The analysis of imperialism made by Lenin is a direct continuation of Marx's *Capital*. "The service Lenin rendered, and, consequently, his new contribution, was that on the basis of the main postulates enunciated in *Capital* he made a fundamental Marxian analysis of imperialism as the final phase of capitalism, he exposed its ulcers and the conditions of its inevitable doom. On the basis of this analysis arose Lenin's well-known postulate that the conditions of imperialism made possible the victory of socialism in separate capitalist countries" <sup>41</sup> A further Marxist analysis of the imperialist epoch is given in Stalin's works. The Great October Socialist Revolution in the U S S R for the first time in history laid the foundation for the new and higher socio-economic formation, daring conjectures and brilliant prognostications of which are found in *Capital*. On the basis of richest practical experience in the building of the Soviet Union, an analysis of the laws of motion of the transitional period and the socialist system of national economy has been given in the talented writings of Lenin and Stalin.

The doctrine of imperialism, created and elaborated by Lenin and Stalin on the basis of the fundamental postulates of *Capital*, served as a key to the understanding of the nature and special features of the bandit Hitlerite imperialism, which has plunged

the world into the depths of the most bloody and devastating of all wars. Long before the present war Lenin and Stalin made an exhaustive and many-sided characterization of German imperialism as the most aggressive, predatory, and piratical type. They exposed the deepest historical roots and mainsprings of German imperialism, analyzed the factors of its strength and weakness, indicated the sources of its inevitable downfall.

Starting from several of the most important postulates of Marx, Lenin carefully analyzed the peculiarities of Germany's historical development, which caused that country to be the home of the most humanity-hating, cannibalistic, and piratical imperialism. In Hitlerism all the reactionary refuse of Germany's historical development—castigated by Marx with such merciless power in several of his works, including *Capital*—have found their most concentrated embodiment. The repulsive features of German philistinism, Prusso-Junker militarism, the chauvinist obscurantism of the German nationalists, the bandit traditions of the landsknechts—all this has been raised to the highest power in Hitlerism.

The works of Comrade Stalin have provided an exhaustive appraisal of the nature of Hitlerism, its essence and methods, they have indicated the true face of the enemy and have formulated the judgment of history on German bandit imperialism.

## CHAPTER II

### A General Characterization of *Capital*

*Capital* is not only a very great work on political economy, it also has a philosophical and historical content of enormous profundity, and the historical, philosophical, and politico-economic contents of *Capital* are organically interconnected. This work is encyclopedic in the full sense of the word, it is the best expression of Marx's method, and at the same time it is striking in the breadth of its author's scientific interests—for Marx had skillfully mastered the most diverse branches of knowledge.

The philosophical side of *Capital* is contained in the fact that the method of materialist dialectics, created by Marx and elaborated here, found its fullest, most detailed and many-sided application primarily in the study of a specific and most important socio-economic formation—the capitalist formation.

As to the historical content of *Capital*, in investigating the capitalist mode of production Marx dealt with a colossal quantity of concrete facts—he drew widely on concrete historical information, both from the period of capitalism's development and from the period of the formation and evolution of capitalist relations. Whole chapters and sections of *Capital* are richly steeped in concrete historical material. Let us but recall the account of labor legislation and the struggle of the working class to shorten the working day, the chapter on the primitive ac-

cumulation of capital, where, on the basis of a wealth of concrete historical material, Marx exposed for the first time the actual historical roots of capitalism and sketched the vivid and shocking picture of how the fundamental conditions of its rise were created. Throughout *Capital* Marx undertakes profound excursions into the history of the ancient world and the Middle Ages, even into the history of the primitive communal order. These excursions, taken singly and as a whole, constitute a most valuable repository of historical science, and no Marxist historian can fulfill his tasks without mastering the whole amazing richness of historical content in Marx's *Capital*.

## 1 THE STRUCTURAL PLAN OF *CAPITAL*

Marx divided *Capital* into three volumes. This division of the material is not accidental or external. On the contrary, it flows of necessity from the very essence of Marx's economic teaching.

The first volume deals with the process of production of capital. Marx's point of departure was the primacy of production, *i.e.*, the postulate that production is the sphere that determines all other aspects of economic life. From this there naturally flowed the necessity of opening the investigation with the process of capitalist production. In the first volume, where this process is analyzed, the analysis of the production of surplus value holds the central position.

The second volume of *Capital* deals with the process of circulation. Commodities produced in a capitalist enterprise must be sold. Only on this condition will the capitalist extract the surplus value contained in the commodities and produced by wage labor. In the sphere of circulation another process takes place—the process of the transformation of capital from its monetary into its commodity form. With his money the capitalist buys new commodities, such commodities, of course, as are necessary for the continuation and ceaseless renewal of the process of capitalist production. Consequently, to use Marx's expression,



the process of capitalist reproduction must be enabled by the process of circulation. This enabling of the process of capitalist reproduction by the process of circulation, and the problems arising from this, are the subject of the second volume of *Capital*. Finally, after the process of capitalist production has been analyzed in the first volume and the process of capitalist circulation in the second, in the third volume of *Capital* Marx gives an analysis of capitalist production taken as a whole. Here he considers the phenomena and relations that arise in an analysis of capitalist production taken as a whole, *i.e.*, not apart from circulation, but in its totality, including circulation.

In pointing out that in *Capital* Marx makes a scientific analysis of the production relations of capitalist society, Lenin outlined what he called the "skeleton" of the book in the following fashion:

"This analysis is strictly confined to the relations of production between the members of society without even resorting to factors other than relations of production to explain the matter, Marx makes it possible to discern how the commodity organization of social economy develops, how it becomes transformed into capitalist economy, creating the antagonistic (within the bounds now of relations of production) classes, the bourgeoisie and the proletariat, how it develops the productivity of social labor and how it thereby introduces an element which comes into irreconcilable contradiction to the very foundations of this capitalist organization itself."<sup>1</sup>

Lenin more than once emphasized that the basic content of *Capital* lay in the scientific analysis of the fact that capitalist society is founded on the opposition between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat. As has already been said, the basic content of the first volume of *Capital* is the doctrine of surplus value, which considers the relations between the two basic classes of capitalist society, the bourgeoisie and the proletariat.

Marx wrote in *Capital*:

"A greater number of laborers working together, at the same

time, in one place in order to produce the same sort of commodity under the mastership of one capitalist, constitutes, both historically and logically, the starting point of capitalist production”<sup>2</sup>

Accordingly, Marx indicates that historically and logically the starting point of capitalist production is an enterprise belonging to a capitalist, in which wage labor is put to work. As is known, capitalist enterprise arises first in the form of capitalist manufacture. Thus Marx’s statement must be understood in the sense that historically and logically capitalist manufacture is the starting point of capitalist production. Yet Marx, as we know, begins his exposition in *Capital* with an analysis of the commodity. This he does in order to reveal the secret of surplus value, which is bound up with the transformation of labor power into a commodity. And in order to analyze the special features of this peculiar commodity—labor power—he must first of all dissect the basic features of commodity production in general.

Commodity production precedes the rise of capitalist production. The beginnings of commodity production date back many thousands of years before the capitalist era. At the end of the Middle Ages commodity production had already reached a comparatively high development. But only under capitalism does commodity production take on a universal character and become the prevailing form of production. The analysis of the commodity with which Marx begins his exposition serves as a necessary preliminary step in disclosing the secret of surplus value.

Thus the sequence of the exposition of problems adopted by Marx in *Capital* flows naturally from the fact that he was laying out new paths in science, that his purpose was to rebuild the science of political economy from the very beginning. But it would be ludicrous and harmful pedantry, in radical contradiction to the whole spirit of Marxism-Leninism, if one were to preserve unchanged the same sequence in, for instance, a study

of the basic features of this science or in going through an elementary course in it

In analyzing the basic features of capitalist production Marx's approach is that of a dialectical materialist, who discloses the essence and content of production relations between people. Where bourgeois economists saw relations between things, the exchange of one commodity for another, Marx revealed relations between people. Taking up the commodity as the elementary form of wealth in bourgeois society, Marx, to use Lafargue's picturesque phrasing, "twists it in every direction, turns it inside out,"<sup>3</sup> and discloses its most occult secrets, which for the bourgeois economists had remained a book sealed with seven seals. Marx showed that the commodity, its value, the exchange of commodities—all these are not attributes and movements of things by themselves, but are the form of expression of specific social-production relations between people. Marx revealed the secret of commodity fetishism.

Further analysis shows how with the rise and development of money the connection between people as commodity producers becomes closer, more many-sided. At the same time the contradictions of commodity production also grow. The function of money as a means of circulation already gives rise, as Marx showed, to the possibility of crises. This possibility becomes still more developed when money begins to fulfill one of its later functions—that of means of payment.<sup>4</sup>

With the predominance of monetary relations all the relations between people become gilded or silver-plated. But Marx points out that "gold and silver are not by nature money, money is by nature gold and silver."<sup>5</sup> In other words, specific production relations between people can be expressed only with the aid of things, in this instance, with the aid of things that play the role of money.

After analyzing the commodity and money Marx proceeds to the analysis of capital. Here again he shows in the first place that, in spite of the assertions of vulgar economy,<sup>6</sup> capital is not

a thing, but a social relation. He examines the essence of this social relation, showing the historical conditions of its origin and development, disclosing the tendencies that this development carries within itself.

The structure of the first volume of *Capital*, in its most general outlines, takes the following form:

Part I<sup>7</sup> is devoted to an examination of the commodity and money. Here are considered two factors of the commodity—its use value and its value, the twofold character of the labor embodied in the commodity is analyzed. The analysis of the forms of value reproduces vast historical material characterizing the basic steps in the development of exchange and commodity production. In the chapter on money the essence of money is considered, and its functions in capitalist society are taken up one by one, in this case the transition from one function to another reflecting the historical process of development of commodity production.

Part II deals with the transformation of money into capital. Marx lays special stress on the fact that the transformation of money into capital, the transition from the formula for simple commodity circulation, C-M-C, to another formula, M-C-M,\* characteristic of capitalist circulation, is by no means an arbitrary device or a mere mental fancy, but carries concealed within it the transition from one historical epoch of social development to another.

Marx analyzes the conditions under which money can be converted into capital. He shows that the basic condition of this transformation is the presence of a commodity of a special type, the presence of the commodity labor power. Capitalist production is precisely that stage of commodity production at which

\*C-M-C, "the transformation of commodities into money, and the change of money back again into commodities." M-C-M, "the transformation of money into commodities, and the change of commodities back again into money" (*Capital*, Vol. I, p. 124, International ed.)—*Tr*

not only the product of labor becomes a commodity, but also human labor power itself. As a commodity, labor power has value. Marx shows how this value is determined, and at the same time reveals the fundamental distinction of this peculiar commodity—it stands out from the rest of the commodity world by virtue of the fact that its use—labor—is a process that creates value.

In Part III Marx passes to the consideration of absolute surplus value. In the fifth chapter [Ch VII] an extremely important analysis is made of the labor process under capitalist conditions, when this process is at once a process of labor and a process of expanding value, or producing surplus value. Here we have a detailed demonstration of the fact that the value of the commodity labor power and the value received by the capitalist by the productive use of this commodity are two different magnitudes. The sixth chapter [Ch VIII], is devoted to a consideration of the difference between constant and variable capital, the seventh [Ch IX] to the rate of surplus value, which serves as an indicator of the degree of capitalist exploitation.

The eighth chapter [Ch X], very broad and rich in concrete material, deals with the struggle over the working day. Here there is a vivid description of the difference between the capitalist and the other forms of exploitation that preceded it. Further, two fundamental stages of the struggle over the lengthening of the working day are analyzed. During the first period—from the middle of the fourteenth century to the end of the eighteenth century—under conditions of a still undeveloped capitalism, when the preconditions of capitalist production were only in the process of formation, the dominant classes had to resort to government co-operation in order to lengthen the working day by legislative means, since the action of economic laws alone did not enable them to achieve a lengthening of the working day corresponding to their appetites. The second period was completely opposite to the first. Capital now had at its disposal a sufficient quantity of free wage labor, by its economic

pressure it could force the propertyless proletarians to agree to any, even the heaviest, conditions of labor, under threat of death by starvation. By that time the working class was forced to engage in struggle for the shortening of the working day, in which it turned to government authorities with the demand for legislative regulation of working hours.

In Part IV Marx passes to the analysis of the production of relative surplus value. After describing the concept of relative surplus value in the tenth chapter [Ch. XII], Marx analyzes in the next three chapters the three principal steps by which capitalism raises the productivity of labor: simple capitalist co-operation, the division of labor and manufacture, machinery and large-scale industry.

A most important part of this section is the extensive thirteenth chapter [Ch. XV], devoted to machinery and large-scale industry. At the beginning of its existence, when it was coming into being, capital did not basically revolutionize the mode of production. Originally it used the same technique of production as that of the small-scale production that preceded it. The basic revolutionizing of the very character of production came later, when capital called to life machinery, created large-scale enterprises, and generated large-scale mechanized industry. Only by this means, as Marx points out, did capital create for itself an adequate technical base, *i.e.*, a base corresponding to its insatiable nature, its boundless craving for surplus labor.

The development of capitalism in agriculture,<sup>8</sup> as in industry, means, to use Marx's expression, the "martyrdom of the producer"; it is inevitably accompanied by the undermining of the sources of all wealth—the land and the laborer. The exploitation of the peasants in capitalist society differs from the exploitation of the proletariat only in its form.

In the chapter on machinery rich historical material is included, along with a detailed theoretical analysis of the contradictions in the capitalist application of machinery.

In the comparatively short Part V, Marx analyzes the interre-

relationships and connection between absolute and relative surplus value

Part VI is devoted to a consideration of wages, with the center of Marx's attention being directed to a demonstration of how wages mask the relation of capitalist exploitation. The form of wages creates the outward and deceptive appearance that what is paid for is not labor power, but labor itself. After an analysis of the two basic forms of wages—time and piece—in the twentieth chapter [Ch XXII] Marx goes into national differences in wages, showing their dependence on the historical peculiarities marking the development of capitalism in individual countries.

Part VII—the final and concluding section of the first volume of *Capital*<sup>9</sup>—Marx gives an analysis of the process of capital accumulation.

In the first volume of *Capital*, as distinct from the second and third, Marx analyzes the process of capital accumulation without yet covering the circulation process, which in the actual course of capitalist accumulation plays a very substantial role. Here, as he points out, he considers the process of accumulation in its pure form, abstractly, "as a mere phase in the actual process of production."<sup>10</sup> Yet even this analysis shows us a great deal in a different light from what went before, after a consideration of simple reproduction in the twenty-first chapter [Ch XXIII], Marx proceeds in the next chapter to the conversion of surplus value into capital, that is, to a consideration of capitalist extended reproduction. The twenty-third chapter [Ch XXV] is devoted to the exposition and proof of the general law of capitalist accumulation, which causes a growth of misery at one pole of society parallel with the accumulation of wealth at its other pole. The internal mechanism of capitalist accumulation is such that with the development of capitalism there also grows insecurity of existence for the worker, unemployment, the threat of death by starvation. The reserve army of unemployed is a powerful weapon in the hands of the capitalists.

for lowering the living standard of the proletariat. Hence the inevitability not only of the relative, but also of the absolute, impoverishment of the proletariat under capitalism, the inevitability of the sharpening of the class contradictions between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat. This chapter—one of the most extensive in scope—is steeped in rich factual material illustrating the operation of the general law of capitalist accumulation.

In the twenty-fourth chapter [Ch XXVI-XXXII] Marx takes up the so-called primitive accumulation of capital, *i.e.*, the process of creating the historical preconditions of the capitalist mode of production. He shows how this process in reality had nothing in common with the idyllic picture drawn by bourgeois economists. Actually capital is born "dripping from every pore with blood and dirt."<sup>11</sup> The conditions of capitalist production are created by means of robbery and fraud, by means of forcible expropriation of the land from the peasant masses, by means of colonial atrocities and piracy on the high seas. At the end of this chapter—in the famous seventh paragraph, "The Historical Tendency of Capitalistic Accumulation" [Ch XXXII]—with tremendous power and eloquence Marx formulates the historical mission of capitalism, and defines its place in history. The process of capital accumulation leads to an intensification and sharpening of the class contradictions in capitalist society. An ever greater number of the population is converted into propertyless proletarians, an ever greater quantity of wealth is concentrated in the hands of a small handful of capitalists. Thus the overwhelming majority of the population is expropriated, and further development leads to the inevitable outcome. "The knell of capitalist private property sounds."

This conclusion as to the necessity of the socialist revolution and the dictatorship of the proletariat which expropriates the expropriators is the natural result of the whole scientific investigation of capitalism unfolded by Marx in *Capital*. Marx reveals and proves scientifically the necessity of the proletarian



revolution, which destroys the capitalist order and begins the process of constructing a new, socialist society

Finally, the twenty-fifth [Ch XXXIII] and last chapter<sup>12</sup> of the first volume of *Capital* is essentially a digression dealing with the then current theory of colonization—a digression whose purpose is to describe the conditions of existence and development of capitalist society

Such is the sequence in which individual problems are set forth in *Capital*

## 2 HOW THE EXPOSITION IS TIED TOGETHER INTERNALLY

A study of *Capital* shows that each step of Marx's analysis, each transition from the consideration of one economic category to the analysis of the next economic category reproduces a broad range of historical factual material and corresponds to specific phases of development of the actual historical scene

The order in which the categories follow one another in *Capital* is marked by an amazing logical harmony. Yet these categories are nothing but the theoretical expression of social production relations in their concrete historical development. The logical course of development of the economic categories in *Capital* reflects the great road of historical development, only in a form stripped of accidental circumstances and secondary phenomena. It was this aspect of the work that Lenin had in mind when he described *Capital* as "a history of capitalism and an analysis of the *concepts* that summarize it"<sup>13</sup> *Capital* provides a solution, classic in its clarity and correctness, to the problem of correlating historical and logical methods of research, a problem that is soluble only from the standpoint of dialectical materialism. The train of investigative thought begins at the same point at which the historical development of the observed phenomenon opens. The simplest relation arises considerably earlier than the more complex. In the further

course of history complex relations develop from the simpler ones "Factual verification respective to practice is present at *every* step of the analysis"<sup>14</sup> Thus the logical development in *Capital* reproduces and summarizes the actual course of the historical development of society For precisely this reason the laws revealed in *Capital* are the laws of the historical rise, development, and downfall of capitalism

While explaining Marx's method in a polemic directed against the enemies of Marxism, who were trying to distort and vulgarize it, Lenin emphasizes that Marx began "from the beginning and not from the end with an analysis of the facts and not with final conclusions, with a study of partial, historically determined social relations and not with general theories about the nature of social relations in general!"<sup>15</sup>

And, addressing the opponents of Marxism, Lenin posed this question "Whence are you to get your concept of society and progress in general when you have not studied a single social formation in particular?"<sup>16</sup>

In his article "The Three Sources and Three Component Parts of Marxism," Lenin describes Marx's investigation of capitalism "Marx traced the development of capitalism from the first germs of commodity economy, from simple exchange, to its highest forms, to large-scale production," wrote Lenin Showing how Marx traces this vast historical development, which embraced several centuries, Lenin comments

"Where the bourgeois economists saw a relation of things (the exchange of one commodity for another), Marx revealed a *relation of men* The exchange of commodities expresses the tie by which individual producers are bound through the market *Money* signifies that this tie is becoming closer and closer, inseparably binding the entire economic life of the individual producers into one whole *Capital* signifies a further development of this tie man's labor power becomes a commodity

"Capital, created by the labor of the worker, presses on the

worker by ruining the small masters and creating an army of unemployed

"By destroying small-scale production, capital leads to an increase in productivity of labor and to the creation of a monopoly position for the associations of big capitalists. Production itself becomes more and more social—hundreds of thousands and millions of workers become bound together in a systematic economic organism—but the product of the collective labor is appropriated by a handful of capitalists. The anarchy of production grows, as do crises, the furious chase after markets and the insecurity of existence of the mass of the population."

The development of the contradictions of capitalism at the same time prepares the triumph of the proletariat. "Capitalism has triumphed all over the world," wrote Lenin in 1913, "but this triumph is only the prelude to the triumph of labor over capital." <sup>17</sup>

The triumph of labor over capital—that is the fundamental conclusion of Marx's analysis of the laws of development of capitalism. Already in the elementary cell of capitalist economy, in the commodity, Marx uncovered the embryo of all the contradictions of capitalism. Further investigation shows how these embryos develop, how the contradictions of the capitalist order grow and extend themselves—those contradictions which are manifested in a violent and catastrophic form during crises and which prepare the way for the inevitable end of capitalism.

Lenin pointed out that the essence of dialectics lies in "the division of the one and the cognition of its contradictory parts." <sup>18</sup> If we approach *Capital* from this point of view, we shall see that Marx, in his many-sided and profound penetration into the inner mysteries of the capitalist mode of production, discloses the contradictions of the capitalist real world and shows the growth of these contradictions, their transition from lower to higher levels of development. He shows how a resolving of these contradictions within the framework of capitalism inevitably leads to their reproduction on a new and higher level.

Marx begins with an analysis of the commodity. The commodity, as we know, has a twofold nature. On the one hand, it is a use value, on the other it is exchange value. One must keep in mind that these two aspects of the commodity were known before Marx's time. Not only did the classical economists know them, but also the great thinker of antiquity, Aristotle. Marx speaks of this in *Capital*. Aristotle wrote that sandals could be used in two ways: in the first place, they could be worn, and, secondly, they could be exchanged for another object. If with Aristotle the idea of the two-fold use of goods was expressed in a still rather primitive form, the economists of the bourgeois epoch, especially the classical economists, made most detailed and thorough studies of the two factors of the commodity—use value and exchange value.

But Marx does not stop with the analysis already made by his predecessors. He goes on and discloses that, just as the commodity is twofold, so also the labor that creates the commodity has a twofold character: on the one hand, it is concrete labor, creating use value, and on the other it is abstract labor, creating the value of the commodity. Marx emphasized that the twofold character of labor is a point of very great importance for the understanding of all the further problems of political economy, if one is to plumb the depths of the production relations in capitalist production. Marx says that the twofold character of labor is a central point in the analysis, one from which an understanding of all capitalist production relations must start.

What was the significance of this discovery of the twofold character of labor? First of all, only this discovery made it possible consistently and irrefutably to define the value of commodities as the socially necessary labor time expended on their production. All Marx's predecessors had proved themselves powerless to answer the following objection. They said that value is created by labor. But actually labor is very dissimilar: the labor of a tailor differs sharply from that of a miner, the labor of a jeweler from that of a shoemaker, and so forth. It is

easy to observe that this qualitative difference cannot help but be reflected on the quantitative side of things the value created by the jeweler or watchmaker in the course of one working day cannot be the same as the value created by the labor of an unskilled worker in the course of a working day Marx's predecessors could not find a satisfactory answer to this objection The discovery of the twofold character of labor made it possible for Marx to resolve this difficulty completely As concrete labor the labor of commodity producers is dissimilar, and in this capacity it creates use value With regard to the abstract labor that creates the value of a commodity, this abstract labor is always the same value-forming substance, it is a congealing of undifferentiated equal human labor in general And, in its capacity of abstract labor, complex labor means only multiplied simple labor, or simple labor raised to a higher power

Thus the difference between complex and simple labor, between skilled and unskilled labor, which was a stumbling block for Marx's predecessors in the field of the labor theory of value, was fully explained by Marx on the basis of his discovery of the twofold character of the labor embodied in commodities

The doctrine of the twofold character of labor plays a leading role in the whole of Marx's further analysis From the first beginnings of exchange, from the simple or accidental form of value, right down to the crises of the world market—such is the range of Marx's investigation in *Capital* And at the most important nodal points of this investigation, when decisive phases in the historical development of capitalism, and the categories corresponding to them (money, surplus value, capital, etc ), are being revealed, again and again we come upon the doctrine of the twofold character of labor

With the appearance of money comes the division of the commodity The previously united world of commodities is split into two poles, the internal contradiction between use value and value that already exists in the commodity now developing into an external contradiction—the contradiction

between commodity and money. Money appears as the embodiment of abstract labor. All other commodities appear as the embodiment of concrete labor. Historical development leads to the spreading and extension of monetary relations and thereby to the deepening of this contradiction.

Under capitalism human labor power itself becomes a commodity. This marks a new historical level in the development of commodity relations—there appears a commodity of an altogether special type, and its appearance is connected with a revolutionizing of the whole mode of social production. The transformation of labor power into a commodity means the coming into being of the capitalist mode of production. Marx's predecessors could not get to the bottom of the secrets of capitalist exploitation. On the surface it appeared as though the worker sold his labor to the capitalist. The exponents of bourgeois classical political economy could not solve the contradiction implied in the fact that, on the one hand, labor creates value, and, on the other hand, in its capacity of wage labor, labor has value. For this contradiction, before which the greatest of Marx's predecessors stopped helplessly, Marx found the following brilliant solution: he pointed out that what the worker sells to the capitalist is not his labor, but his labor power. The analysis of labor power as a commodity belongs wholly and completely to Marx. He was the one to show that the labor power of the proletarian is the commodity sold by him to the capitalist, and that the buying and selling of labor power is what brings about the relation of capitalist exploitation. This discovery by Marx is closely connected with the fact that he not only analyzed the contradiction between use value and value, but also revealed the contradiction between abstract and concrete labor.

Marx continues his analysis to show that labor power, like any commodity, is, on the one hand, value and, on the other, use value. Furthermore the value of the commodity labor power is determined as is the value of any other commodity, but in

distinction from the others, this commodity has a specific and peculiar use value, not shared by other commodities. This use value consists in the fact that human labor power can produce more value than it itself is worth as a commodity. This is the source of the capitalist's wealth, the source of the surplus value that lies at the basis of the whole capitalist order.

Marx laid open those pages of history on which is inscribed in the flaming language of iron and blood the creation of the conditions that gave rise to the capitalist mode of production. As he approaches the cornerstone of his whole economic doctrine—the investigation of surplus value—Marx points out: "Nature does not produce on the one side owners of money or commodities, and on the other men possessing nothing but their own labor-power. This relation has no natural basis, neither is its social basis one that is common to all historical periods. It is clearly the result of a past historical development, the product of many economical revolutions, of the extinction of a whole series of older forms of social production."<sup>19</sup>

The category surplus value had made its first appearance in political economy long before, with the physiocrats.\* But Marx was the first to disclose the real nature of surplus value as the propelling nerve and motive of the capitalist mode of production, as the fundamental category, expressing the relations between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat. "The doctrine of surplus value is the corner-stone of Marx's economic theory,"<sup>20</sup> as Lenin emphasized.

Marx revealed the secret of capitalist exploitation. The doctrine of surplus value is his great discovery, and has made his name immortal. Marx uncovered the deepest economic foundation of the contradiction of the class interests of the bourgeoisie

\* The physiocratic theory was developed in the feudal conditions of eighteenth century France, and attributed the origin of all surplus wealth to agricultural labor. This surplus ("*produit net*"), according to the physiocrats, first took the form of rent to landowners and subsequently circulated among the other classes of society.—*Tr*

and the proletariat. The exchange transaction—purchase and sale of labor power—this introductory act of capitalist exploitation, is only in its external, illusory appearance an ordinary purchase-and-sale transaction between a commodity owner on the one side and an owner of money on the other. In fact the positions of the two parties to this transaction are radically different: fear of death by starvation forces the worker to sell his only commodity, labor power, whereas the capitalist exploits wage labor through his monopoly of ownership in the means and conditions of production. Thus wage labor was exposed as a system of wage slavery. But capitalism is a social order that cannot even secure to its slaves their slave existence. It ruins small-scale production and throws masses of formerly independent producers into the ranks of the proletariat, unemployment is its inevitable companion. The presence of a reserve army of unemployed rivets the worker to the capitalist more firmly than Hephaistos' hammer riveted Prometheus to the rock.\*

Continuing his analysis, Marx investigates the process of capitalist production and shows that this process is on the one hand a labor process, and on the other the process of the expansion of value. Here again a large role is played by the difference, established in the first chapter, between abstract and concrete labor. Marx showed that the labor of a worker in a capitalist enterprise is on the one hand concrete labor, creating a specific use value and transferring the value of consumed means of production to the finished product, and on the other hand, as abstract labor, it is the creator of new value, which embodies in the first place the value of the expended labor power and, secondly, a

\* According to ancient Greek mythology, the titan-god Prometheus (whose name means "forethought") was condemned by Zeus, ruler of the gods, to be fastened to a rock in a desert waste with an eagle gnawing at his liver for the crime of "philanthropy," *i.e.*, for teaching mortals all the arts and crafts, starting with the use of fire, which he stole from heaven. Hephaistos (or Vulcan, as the ancient Romans called him), the blacksmith god, was delegated by Zeus to execute the sentence.—*Tr*



certain surplus over this, a certain accrual, *z e*, surplus value

Directly connected with this is Marx's further analysis—the analysis of capital and its different parts, which play diverse roles in the process of production of surplus value. Marx was the first to show that capital is divided into constant and variable. This division is of greatest significance in his theory of surplus value. It makes possible the isolation of that part of the capital which is responsible for the expansion of the whole from that part which does not change its magnitude. This division of capital is the natural outcome and consequence of the analysis of the twofold character of labor made by Marx in the first chapter of *Capital*.

In *Capital* Marx shows that bourgeois society differs from preceding types of exploitative regimes only in the form in which surplus labor is sucked from the masses of direct producers. Hence "bourgeois society no less than its predecessors is exposed as a grandiose institution for the exploitation of the huge majority of the people by a small, ever diminishing minority."<sup>21</sup> Illusions and hypocritical phrases about the harmony of interests under capitalism were dealt a mortal blow. Capitalism stood forth as a regime of wage slavery substituting economic bondage for previous forms of domination and subjection based on the open personal dependence of the producer.

And yet capitalism is a higher, more progressive form of society compared to the forms that preceded it—feudalism and the slaveowning order. For the *form* of the exploitation is itself an *essential* factor. Capitalist exploitation differs from previous forms of exploitation in that, as Marx put it, it prepares the direct producers, *z e*, the working class, for the fulfillment of an altogether different role—namely, the building of socialism. Slaveowning society breeds in the slave masses a burning hatred for the exploiters, but the slaves are not in a position to counterpose the existing order with any positive program. The slaves are not capable of rising higher than dreams about restoring the "good old days" when they were free small-scale producers.

Feudalism does prepare the enslaved masses of enserfed peasantry for the fulfillment of revolutionary tasks. But the peasants are not in a position to achieve anything beyond the destruction of feudal bonds, the freeing of the land and the whole sphere of production relations from outlived norms that block the free development of commodity-capitalist relations. Only the proletariat, schooled by capitalism, is capable of realizing an incomparably higher historical mission—namely, the winning of socialism. It is capable of this because the very form of capitalist exploitation presupposes the freedom of the proletarian from the bonds and ties of personal dependence, and makes him a person accustomed to managing his own affairs independently and answering for his own actions, whereas slave and serf are shackled by the chains of direct and unconcealed personal bondage.

All progressive layers of society rally their forces when an attempt is made to revive under capitalism the reactionary methods of exploitation characteristic of precapitalist social systems—of feudalism and the slaveowning order. In our time the Hitlerite watchdogs of German plutocracy have undertaken just this sort of experiment. In the interests of the greedy, selfish upper layer of the German financial oligarchy, they have attempted to revive in Europe the most barbaric methods of exploitation, to introduce their special brand of imperialist neo-feudalism in Germany for the "German master class," which bases itself on a revival of the slaveowning order in the occupied countries of Europe. The Hitlerites have tried to subjugate the popular masses of the enslaved countries, expropriating them in the most bestial fashion, depriving them of every vestige of human rights, converting the toiling people into slaves of the German princes, barons, and monopolists, reducing the workers, peasants, and intellectuals of the European countries to the condition of dumb working beasts. This arch-reactionary attempt to revive the crudest and most merciless of the already long outlived forms of exploitation has threatened whole peoples with

direct physical extinction This attempt of the Hitlerite adventurers has been decisively rebuffed by all progressive, all freedom-loving mankind, and in the first embattled ranks of the fighters against Hitlerism stand the land of socialism—the U S S R —our Red Army, and the conscious workers of all freedom-loving countries

Marx was the first to show that capital is “a special, historically defined, social relation of production”<sup>22</sup> In *Capital* the foundations of the class contradictions between proletariat and bourgeoisie were exposed with exhaustive thoroughness and clarity The secret of the self-expansion of capital was made clear in the following sense “Capital is dead labor, that, vampire-like, only lives by sucking living labor”<sup>23</sup> It was shown that “in capitalist society spare time is acquired for one class by converting the whole life-time of the masses into labor-time,”<sup>24</sup> that capital “in its were-wolf hunger for surplus-labor”<sup>25</sup> greedily undermines the sources of all wealth the labor power of society and the land

The enormous role played by the exploiters’ state, that instrument for suppressing the resistance of the exploited masses, is sharply portrayed in *Capital*

Capitalism is the direct continuation, the natural successor, the inevitable offspring of simple commodity production At the same time it represents a new phase in the development of commodity production, in which many features of small-scale production, based on personal labor, are transformed into their opposite The property laws of simple commodity production are transformed into the laws of capitalist appropriation The right of the small producer to appropriate the product of his own labor is replaced by the right of the capitalist to appropriate the product of alien labor—the labor of scores of workers Marx exposes the absurdity of the reactionary-utopian nonsense preached by petty-bourgeois “socialists” like Proudhon about abolishing the “evils” of capitalism while preserving the bases of commodity production, private property in the means of pro-

duction, "just" laws of commodity exchange, etc. Actually the laws of commodity production inevitably give rise to capitalist relations and capitalist exploitation<sup>20</sup>

Proceeding from the division of capital into constant and variable, Marx for the first time introduces the concept of the organic composition of capital, which is something else besides the value ratio of constant to variable capital, in as much as it reflects the ratio of dead to living labor, of accumulated to living labor. The development of capitalism leads to a steady rise in the organic composition of capital. Under capitalism it is precisely in the growth of the organic composition of capital that the process of development of the productive forces is expressed and made manifest. In bourgeois society the process of development of the productive forces—which occurs under any mode of production—takes a unique form, peculiar to this society: the form of a growth in the organic composition of capital. This leads directly and incontrovertibly to Marx's most important conclusion—that of the general law of capitalist accumulation. If in the course of development of bourgeois society, in the process of capitalist accumulation, constant capital grows more rapidly than variable, this means a relative contraction in the part of capital used for buying labor power, and a growth in the reserve army of unemployed, in the impoverishment of the proletariat, etc.

Marx's predecessors, surveying the capitalist scene of their time, more than once commented on the impoverishment of the toiling masses. The misery of the toilers was such that it forced itself sharply on the attention of every observer. Some economists—Malthus and others—tried to shift responsibility for all the misfortunes onto nature. Other economists halted in confusion and alarm before the growing misery of the masses, unable to provide any sort of satisfactory explanation for this phenomenon. Marx's predecessors did not see that the impoverishment of the working class is an immutable law of capitalism, peculiar to this social order and flowing inevitably from its very

essence Only Marx was able to demonstrate the inevitability of the absolute and relative impoverishment of the proletariat under capitalism as a law of the sharpening of contradictions between classes—the bourgeoisie and the proletariat

In the course of his further analysis Marx reveals the law of the concentration and centralization of capital Having transformed masses of peasants and small artisans into propertyless proletarians, as it develops further, capitalism dooms ever broader layers of property owners to ruination As a result of the law of concentration and centralization of capital, the biggest capitalists expropriate a multitude of small and middle-sized capitalists One capitalist kills many

"New and important in the highest degree is the analysis Marx gives in the second volume of *Capital* of the reproduction of the aggregate social capital" <sup>27</sup> This analysis lays bare the difficulties encountered in the process of realization under capitalism, and shows that in the very complexity of the process lie many of the reasons for its irregularity Having discovered in surplus value the source of all unearned income in capitalist society, Marx makes a detailed study of the complex mechanism of distribution of surplus value among the individual groups of exploiters <sup>28</sup> The law of the average rate of profit creates a "capitalist communism" in the division of the loot among the direct receivers of surplus value—the capitalist entrepreneurs Commercial capital gets its share in the form of commercial profit, the landowners get theirs in the form of rent In the form of taxes the state also appropriates a certain part of the surplus value produced by the aggregate labor of the working class The analysis given in *Capital* of precapitalist forms of rent, and also of the role of merchant and usurers' capital—those "antediluvian forms of capital"—sheds a bright light on the history of precapitalist formations and on the genesis of capitalism

The triumphant march of capitalism, its dissemination over the face of the earth, unavoidably leads to a gigantic growth and intensification of its inherent contradictions, which have as their

basis the ever deepening contradiction between the social character of production and the private-capitalist mode of appropriation. *Capital* provided for the first time an exhaustive analysis of the contradictions of capitalism in their development. The concentration and centralization of capital, the victory of large-scale production over small, the increasing exploitation of the proletariat cause an ever greater polarization of society into two opposing camps. The general law of capitalist accumulation dooms the working class to absolute impoverishment, while deepening the gulf between the pole of wealth and the pole of "misery, agony of toil, slavery" <sup>29</sup> The law of the declining tendency of the rate of profit serves as a dread reminder of death for a social order that develops the productive forces of labor at the expense of and in counterposition to the producer himself.

Finally, as the focus in which all the contradictions of capitalism are gathered into one, the crises—devastating tempests of the world market—are clear testimony to the fact that "the whole mechanism of the capitalist mode of production breaks down under the pressure of the productive forces which it itself created" <sup>30</sup> In the *Manifesto of the Communist Party* bourgeois society is compared to a sorcerer who can no longer control the subterranean forces summoned by his incantations <sup>31</sup> Crises show up clearly the "rebellion" of the productive forces of capitalism against its production relations, against the narrow confines of capitalist private property. It is discovered that bourgeois relations have become too narrow to allow room for the wealth they have created. In *Capital* we find proof of the iron inevitability of crises under capitalism. "In order to abolish crises, capitalism must be abolished" <sup>32</sup>

The historical mission of capitalism is sketched in clear outline in *Capital*. "Capitalism is progressive because it destroys the old methods of production and develops productive forces, yet at the same time, at a certain stage of development, it retards the growth of productive forces" <sup>33</sup> Marx showed that the contradictions of bourgeois society do not mean "the impossibility of

capitalism," but do mean the "necessity for its transformation into a higher form"—into socialism, by means of the victorious proletarian revolution. Capitalism prepares the material preconditions for the socialist revolution by developing enormous productive forces and socializing labor in large-scale production, at the same time, in the person of the proletariat, it begets its own gravedigger. "The whole of Marx's *Capital* is devoted to clarifying this truth, that *the basic forces of capitalist society are and can only be the bourgeoisie and the proletariat* the bourgeoisie as the builder of this capitalist society—as its motive power, the proletariat as its gravedigger, as the only force capable of replacing it" <sup>34</sup>

The working class under capitalism goes through a severe but tempering school of toil and struggle. Its whole position prepares it to fulfill its great historical mission.

In the immortal concluding paragraph of the twenty-fourth chapter of the first volume of *Capital* ("Historical Tendency of Capitalistic Accumulation" [Ch XXXII]) Marx paints with unforgettable strokes the inevitability of the new, higher social order. "The monopoly of capital becomes a fetter upon the mode of production, which has sprung up and flourished along with, and under it. Centralization of the means of production and socialization of labor at last reach a point where they become incompatible with their capitalist integument. This integument is burst asunder. The knell of capitalist private property sounds. The expropriators are expropriated" <sup>35</sup>

The economic teaching of Marxism is the most profound, many-sided, and detailed proof of the necessity of the socialist revolution and the dictatorship of the proletariat as the path toward realization of a socialist society.

### 3 THE LITERARY FORM OF *CAPITAL*

In a letter to Engels, Marx, half in jest to be sure, calls *Capital* an "artistic whole." A study of *Capital* that is to any degree

fundamental, an attempt to analyze not only its content, but also its form, is bound to lead one to the conclusion that this description is well merited

Lenin wrote of *Capital*

"The irresistible force of attraction which draws the Socialists of all countries to this theory consists indeed in the fact that it combines a strict and supreme scientific spirit (representing as it does the last word in social science) with a revolutionary spirit, and combines them not by chance, not only because the founder of the doctrine combined in his person the qualities of a man of learning and a revolutionary, but does so intrinsically and inseparably within the theory itself" <sup>36</sup>

Such an excellent connoisseur of artistic literature as Franz Mehring wrote

"Like any great writer, Karl Marx possessed the gift of artistic creativeness, which is manifested in the most brilliant fashion in his mature works, in this respect he occupies one of the first places among the classical prose writers of the nineteenth century. In wealth of images and similes he approaches Lessing or even Goethe, with whom he might have said: 'Do not forbid me the use of similes, without them I would not be able to make myself clear'" <sup>37</sup>

*Capital* charms the reader with that harmonious unity, a fusion of form and content, which is so characteristic of genuine artistic production. In this enormous work every word, every image, every figure, and every fact is in place. One may quite truly say of it: here the words are close-packed, but the thoughts are spacious.

The legend that Marx's basic work was written in a heavy, incomprehensible and inaccessible language is one of those fictions enemies use to fight Marxism. Certainly *Capital* is not a book written with the special aim of popularization. In this work Marx sets himself a different task: to present basic principles, to lay the foundation for a correct understanding of the laws of social development, so that on the basis of his discoveries



the necessary popular expositions might appear, which would make his theory the property of the broad layers of the people. Therefore some preliminary preparation is required in order to master the wealth of ideas contained in *Capital*, and attempts to study this work without the necessary preparation cannot but encounter considerable difficulties.

Apropos of this Marx comments in the postscript to the second edition of the first volume of *Capital*: "The mealy-mouthed babblers of German vulgar economy fell foul of the style of my book." In this connection Marx, "for the benefit and enjoyment of these gentlemen and their public," quotes from two reviews in the English and Russian press. In the latter it is noted that Marx "in no way resembles the majority of German scholars who write their books in a language so dry and obscure that the heads of ordinary mortals are cracked by it." On this review Marx makes the sarcastic comment: "For the readers of contemporary German-national-liberal professional literature not the head, but something quite different is cracked."<sup>38</sup>

In *Capital* Marx deals with a great number of facts, data, concepts, and postulates with which he presumes the reader to be familiar. To have denied himself all this scientific apparatus would have meant an extreme constriction and impoverishment of the content of his work, but had he chosen to explain in popular terms each concept he used, each fact he cited, it would have meant the expansion of his work to an inordinate size, which would have made it far too bulky for the better prepared among his readers.

In *Capital* Marx solved the most difficult and intricate problems of political economy, before which the greatest minds among his predecessors had halted helplessly, he revealed the essence of phenomena, which had been masked behind the deceptive form of their appearance, he analyzed the deep-lying contradictions of the capitalist mode of production.

As is pointed out in the preface to *Capital*, in the analysis of economic forms one can make use of neither microscope nor

chemical reagents—both the one and the other must be replaced by the force of abstraction. Endowed to perfection with the force of scientific abstraction, Marx discloses the economic laws of the capitalist mode of production, which operate and manifest themselves with iron necessity. In the analysis of these laws, to borrow Mehring's happy expression, "his periods roll on like a stream of molten gold." We need only recall, for example, the formulation of the general law of capitalist accumulation or the historical tendency of capitalist accumulation. The unbreakable iron logic, the enormous power of thought, the clear-cut form of presentation—all this lends an irresistible force to the famous periods.

In *Capital* there is an analysis of the commodity form of the product of labor, or the value form of the commodity, which, in Marx's words, is the economic cell form of bourgeois society. Its analysis, Marx observes, may seem to the uninitiated to be simply a series of fine-spun minutiae, but these minutiae are of the kind one meets with, for example, in microscopic anatomy. The analysis of the commodity given in the first chapter is indisputably among the most difficult parts of *Capital*. This chapter has a unique, inimitable coloring: the most abstract statements are time and again enlivened by a bright, memorable image, a picturesque simile, or by the sparkle of sarcastic humor.

Entering on the analysis of the form of value, Marx writes:

"Everyone knows, if he knows nothing else, that commodities have a value form common to them all and presenting a marked contrast with the varied bodily forms of their use values. I mean their money form. Here, however, a task is set us the performance of which has never yet even been attempted by *bourgeois* economy, the task of tracing the genesis of this money form, of developing the expression of value implied in the value relation of commodities, from its simplest, almost imperceptible outline to the dazzling money form. By doing this we shall, at the same time, solve the riddle presented by money."<sup>39</sup>

While explaining the specific role of the coat as a thing in

which value is manifested and emphasizing that this role belongs to the coat by virtue of the fact that it serves as the expression of the value of the linen, Marx writes "This shows that when placed in value relation to the linen, the coat signifies more than when out of that relation, just as many a man strutting about in a gorgeous uniform counts for more than when in mufti " <sup>40</sup>

Then Marx proceeds

"In the production of the coat, human labor power, in the shape of tailoring, must have been actually expended Human labor is therefore accumulated in it In this aspect the coat is a depository of value, but though worn to a thread, it does not let this fact show through And as equivalent of the linen in the value equation, it exists under this aspect alone, counts therefore as embodied value, as a body that is value [In spite of the buttoned-up appearance of the coat, the linen recognizes in it a kindred beautiful value spirit But the coat cannot represent value to the linen unless value at the same time takes the form of a coat ]\* A, for instance, cannot be 'your majesty' to B, unless at the same time majesty in B's eyes assumes the bodily form of A, and, what is more, with every new father of the people, changes its features, hair, and many other things besides " <sup>41</sup>

Further on Marx makes the linen "talk," and it "betrays its thoughts in that language with which alone it is familiar, the language of commodities," etc In Marx's artistic presentation the commodity, as it were, comes alive, acquires volition and in-

\* The sentences in square brackets were not included by Engels in the English edition and are here translated from the German original The full play of humor in this passage is not conveyed in the English translation For instance, the English phrase "depository of value" misses the play on words of the German "*Träger von Wert*"—*Träger* can mean either "bearer" or "wearer" Then, although "buttoned-up" is the literal meaning of "*zugeknöpften*," the German word also means "reserved" Finally, the whole characterization of the meeting of kindred spirits in linen and coat is enlivened by the fact that in German linen is a feminine word and coat a masculine—*Tr*

telligence. Because of this, the analysis and its results stand out in bold relief.

In the second chapter, in analyzing the exchange process, Marx passes from commodities to their owners. He writes:

"It is plain that commodities cannot go to market and make exchanges of their own account. We must, therefore, have recourse to their guardians, who are also their owners. Commodities are things, and therefore without power of resistance against man. If they are wanting in docility he can use force, in other words, he can take possession of them."<sup>42</sup>

Marx examines the relationships arising between people as commodity producers and commodity owners. Here too the imagery of the language renders the account enormously expressive.

"A born leveler and a cynic, it [the commodity—*Tr.*] is always ready to exchange not only soul, but body, with any and every other commodity, be the same more repulsive than *Maritornes*\* herself. The owner makes up for this lack in the commodity of a sense of the concrete by his own five and more senses."<sup>43</sup>

Thus similes—at times startling, but always effective and to the point—and the saturation of the language with images contribute to a clearer expression of the most abstract concepts, the most complex relationships.

Marx naturally achieves the highest artistic force and eloquence of presentation in the passages where he discloses the essence of capitalist exploitation. Reading *Capital* even once one cannot easily forget the picture illustrating the conversion of money into capital. Marx looks upon the transaction of purchase and sale of the commodity labor power as the "introductory act" of capitalist exploitation. This transaction takes place in the sphere of simple circulation, which bourgeois economists

\* Reference to a character in Cervantes' *Don Quixote*, *Maritornes* was chambermaid in an inn which Don Quixote took for a castle—*Tr.*

extol as "a very Eden of the innate rights of man," where the only rulers are freedom, property, and Bentham

Marx characterizes this "very Eden" with annihilating sarcasm and exposes the goddesses of contemporary mythology with murderous irony

"Freedom, because both buyer and seller of a commodity, say of labor power, are constrained only by their own free will. They contract as free agents, and the agreement they come to is but the form in which they give legal expression to their common will. Equality, because each enters into relation with the other, as with a simple owner of commodities, and they exchange equivalent for equivalent. Property, because each disposes only of what is his own. And Bentham, because each looks only to himself. The only force that brings them together and puts them in relation with each other is the selfishness, the gain and the private interests of each. Each looks to himself only, and no one troubles himself about the rest, and just because they do so, do they all, in accordance with the pre-established harmony of things, or under the auspices of an all-shrewd providence, work together to their mutual advantage, for the common weal and in the interest of all " 44

In taking leave of the sphere of simple circulation, where the worker has sold his labor power to the capitalist, writes Marx, we take note of the beginning of a change in the physiognomy of the *dramatis personae* of this transaction

"He, who before was the money owner, now strides in front as capitalist, the possessor of labor power follows as his laborer. The one with an air of importance, smirking, intent on business, the other, timid and holding back, like one who is bringing his own hide to market\* and has nothing to expect but—a hiding " 45

\* Here the English translation permits of some confusion. Closer to the German original (and to the sense of the argument) would be " like one who *has brought* his own hide to market and *now* has nothing to expect but—a hiding "—Tr

With this picture the fourth chapter [Ch VI] of the first volume concludes. Further on there follows the analysis of the internal mechanism of capitalist exploitation—the production of surplus value.

Remarkable examples of brilliant artistic prose are encountered by the reader of *Capital* in the chapter devoted to the disclosure of the secret of capitalist exploitation. Marx emphasizes the insatiable thirst for surplus value that characterizes capitalism. He describes capital as “dead labor, that, vampire-like, only lives by sucking living labor,” and which strives to quench its “vampire thirst for the living blood of labor.”<sup>46</sup> Marx recounts how, in “its were-wolf hunger for surplus labor, capital oversteps not only the moral, but even the merely physical maximum bounds of the working day. It usurps the time for growth, development, and healthy maintenance of the body. It steals the time required for the consumption of fresh air and sunlight. It higgles over a mealtime, incorporating it wherever possible with the process of production itself, so that food is given to the laborer as to a mere means of production, as coal is supplied to the boiler, grease and oil to the machinery. It reduces the sound sleep needed for the restoration, reparation, refreshment of the bodily powers to just so many hours of torpor as the revival of an organism, absolutely exhausted, renders essential. It is not the normal maintenance of the labor power which is to determine the limits of the working day, it is the greatest possible daily expenditure of labor power, no matter how diseased, compulsory, and painful it may be, which is to determine the limits of the laborers’ period of repose. Capital cares nothing for the length of life of labor power. All that concerns it is simply and solely the maximum of labor power that can be rendered fluent in a working day. It attains this end by shortening the extent of the laborer’s life, as a greedy farmer snatches increased produce from the soil by robbing it of its fertility.”<sup>47</sup>

In another part of the same chapter on the working day Marx cites the blacksmith as an example of the devastating effect of

excessive toil in capitalist drudgery " 'We will take the blacksmith as a type ' " [Marx quotes from an article in an English journal—*T7*.] " 'If the poets were true, there is no man so hearty, so merry, as the blacksmith, he rises early and strikes his sparks before the sun, he eats and drinks and sleeps as no other man ' " <sup>48</sup> And in fact, the writer points out, where the work is in moderation, it must be admitted that the craft of the blacksmith is one of the most propitious. But what is done to these merry, hearty people by the capitalist mode of production, with its inevitable companion—excessive labor? It turns out that blacksmiths occupied one of the first places in the English mortality tables. In one industrial quarter of London the death rate for blacksmiths was 31 per thousand, which was 11 above the mean figure. In other words, excessive toil shortens the life of the representatives of this poet-sung profession by one-quarter—the blacksmith dies at the average age of 37 instead of 50.

In his preface to the first edition of the first volume of *Capital* Marx points out that up to that time England was the classical land of capitalism. "That is the reason," he writes, "why England is used as the chief illustration in the development of my theoretical ideas." However, Marx immediately warns that if the German reader should start taking comfort, philistine-fashion, in the fact that in his motherland so far there have not been observed phenomena connected with the development of capitalism, then he must be told "*De te fabula narratur!*" (This story is being told about you!)

In speaking of the economic development of Germany, Marx points to the economic backwardness of that country, by virtue of which "the condition of things is much worse than in England." He writes

"Alongside of modern evils, a whole series of inherited evils oppress us, arising from the passive survival of antiquated modes of production, with their inevitable train of social and political anachronisms. We suffer not only from the living, but

from the dead *Le mort saisit le vif*!"<sup>49</sup> (The dead lays hold of the living!)

Here is posed, in all its sharpness, the problem of the historical peculiarities of Germany's development, by virtue of which reaction plays so important and pernicious a role in German social and political life. Hitlerism proved to be the most poisonous and evil-smelling progeny of this reaction.

Having arisen from historical causes, Germany's socio-economic backwardness was a real curse for that country. Economic backwardness was expressed in the enormous force and vitality of feudal relationships in the countryside and patriarchal-guild relationships in the towns. Over a long period of time economic backwardness was concomitant with political dismemberment, and after this condition had been abolished came the extreme reactionary regime of the "Second Reich," with the unrestricted domination of Junker militarism and obscurantism. In the ideological sphere Germany gave birth to a swarm of arch-reactionary, fanatical troubadours of obscurantism. Making a virtue of necessity, the boastful representatives of German nationalism mounted German backwardness on a pedestal, poisoned the philistine masses with a sense of their own superiority, and isolated them from sources of genuine European culture.

While studying *Capital* one cannot for a moment forget the historical setting in which this work was written and published. When Marx was working on *Capital*, capitalism was still passing through the period of its development on an ascending line, full of energy, it was marching steadily on the upgrade. Many honest and unprejudiced people were sincerely convinced—and interested circles of society were artificially trying to create the impression—that "all was for the best in the best of all possible worlds," as the French proverb says and Marx ironically echoes.

Defenders of money-bags cynically declared the sufferings and deprivations of the popular masses to be something connected with the very laws of nature, disinterested observers futilely enunciated sentimental phrases, appealing to ideas of



right and justice Only Marx could come out as the critic of capitalism proving by his theoretical investigation the historically transitional character of this social order many decades before the victory of the Great October Socialist Revolution in Russia

Many tried to maintain that, as they put it, Marx's theory bore an excessively polemical character, that, forsooth, the whole thing would not be so bad if Marx had not allotted so much space to sharp polemics, that this polemical character exposed Marx's tendentiousness In refutation of this kind of argument Lenin wrote

"The 'system of Marx' has a 'polemical character' not because it is 'tendentious,' but because it accurately portrays the theory of all the contradictions that exist in life Therefore, incidentally, all attempts to assimilate the 'system of Marx' without assimilating its 'polemical character' remain and will remain unsuccessful the 'polemical character' of the system is only the accurate reflection of the 'polemical character' of capitalism itself " <sup>50</sup>

This was said in the 'nineties of the last century and addressed to the legal Marxists,\* who were readily adopting the pose of accepting all that was "scientific" in Marx, while rejecting those aspects of his doctrine in which he appeared in the role of "agitator "

Marx once pointed out "It is only by substituting for conflicting dogmas the conflicting facts and real contradictions which form their hidden background that we can transform political economy into a positive science "

In the "polemical character" of his doctrine Marx is radically

\* So called because their writings were published in the legal press, *i.e.*, were approved by the tsarist censorship This group was formed in the 1890's, when Marxism was beginning to take root in Russia Although they posed as Marxists, they rejected the theory of the proletarian revolution and dictatorship of the proletariat (See *History of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union*, pp 19-22 )—Tr

different from his predecessors, particularly from the greatest exponent of bourgeois classical political economy, David Ricardo Marx, as we know, valued highly Ricardo's scientific merits And in truth Ricardo's works reveal an enormous power of abstract thinking But Ricardo's writing was excessively dispassionate As is known, his theoretical postulates served as a weapon in the struggle of the bourgeoisie, who in England at that time were engaged in exceedingly sharp conflicts with the landowners Ricardo played the role of ideologue for the bourgeoisie in this struggle, and Malthus took the side of the landowners One would suppose that theoretical discussion between the two must have been of a sharp nature As a matter of fact, according to a contemporary writer, "Ricardo's discussion with Malthus and others was carried on in the same peaceful fashion as a chess game or a debate on mathematical problems"

This is quite characteristic Certainly the discussion between Ricardo and Malthus was concerned with very real problems the problem of the corn laws, the problem of banking legislation, of all sorts of financial measures, and so forth Certainly these problems affected the material interests of the bourgeoisie on the one side, and of the landowners on the other But none the less, it was a question of struggle between two factions of the ruling class Both factions were interested in the preservation of the existing order, in its perpetuation

Marx, on the contrary, came forward as representative of a class vitally interested in the most decisive and far-reaching social progress, in the replacement of capitalism by a new, higher, socialist order Hence every line of *Capital* breathes with the strongest hatred of those who strive by force or deception to perpetuate outlived social relationships, it breathes with such passion as cannot but take possession of any honest, freedom-loving person

In the preface to the first volume of *Capital* Marx says that he paints "the capitalist and the landlord in no sense *couleur de rose*," while pointing out that "individuals are dealt with only

in so far as they are personifications of economic categories, embodiments of particular class relations and class interests" <sup>51</sup>

Further on in the text of *Capital* Marx more than once indicates that where he speaks of the capitalist he has in mind "personified capital," *i.e.*, "capital endowed with a will and consciousness"

Marx reveals with tremendous force the nullity of the self-satisfied, obtuse, and limited men of property who consider themselves the salt of the earth. He utterly exposes the selfishness and sanctimoniousness, the hypocrisy and obtuseness of the reactionaries who try to convince mankind that the existing order really is man's highest achievement, that it is impossible to devise anything better. With what artistic expressiveness Marx portrays capital and its personification, the capitalist!

In the eighth chapter [Ch. X], in relating how capitalist entrepreneurs would search first of all in any factory act\* for various loopholes that would allow them to evade or actually violate the act, Marx makes use of the famous Shakespearean character Shylock. When the capitalists began to violate the act of the day, and the factory inspectors protested out of hygienic considerations, capital answered

*My deeds upon my head! I crave the law,  
The penalty and forfeit of my bond*

As is known, in the contract concluded by Shylock there was a provision that the debtor must have a pound of flesh cut from his breast. From no other place, but precisely from the breast must this pound of flesh be cut. Describing the conflict when

\* After the introduction of machine industry, the struggles of the English working class to resist the "violent encroachment" (Marx) of the capitalists resulted in Parliament's passing a series of factory acts limiting the length of the working day, setting special hours of work for women and children, etc. "Nothing is more characteristic of the spirit of capital than the history of the English Factory Acts from 1833-1864" (Marx) —*Tr*

the workers were demanding that the factory act be observed, and capital was violating it, Marx uses the same Shakespearean character. He writes that capital "claimed and obtained the enjoyment not only of making children of eight drudge without intermission from 2 to 8 30 P M, but also of making them hunger during that time." Marx closes with these words from Shakespeare

*Ay, 'his breast' \**  
*So says the bond*<sup>52</sup>

Marx depicts the capitalist as the personification of capital, as capital endowed with consciousness and a will. In doing this he points out that in essence classical political economy also looks at the capitalists from the same standpoint. "If to classical economy the proletarian is but a machine for the production of surplus value, on the other hand, the capitalist is in its eyes only a machine for the conversion of this surplus value into additional capital."<sup>53</sup> Classical bourgeois political economy, genuine spokesman of bourgeois interests, looks upon the capitalist as a machine for accumulation, as a machine for the conversion of surplus value into capital.

Marx analyzes in detail how this requirement of the capitalist mode of production actually materialized. He quotes interesting excerpts from the writing of a certain Dr. Aikin, who describes the development of industry in one of England's biggest industrial centers, Manchester. This Dr. Aikin, in a work published at the end of the eighteenth century, writes that at first industrialists were distinguished by great parsimony. "Even in the early part of the eighteenth century, a Manchester manufacturer, who placed a pint of foreign wine before his guests, exposed himself to the remarks and headshakings of all his neighbors,"

\* Incorrectly quoted in the English edition. Both Shakespearean passages are from the *Merchant of Venice* (Act IV, Scene I) —Tr

because the capitalist was considered to be a machine for the accumulation of capital

The same Dr Aikin provides further testimony "Before the rise of machinery, a manufacturer's evening expenditure at the public house where they all met never exceeded sixpence for a glass of punch, and a penny for a screw of tobacco It was not until 1758, and this marks an epoch, that 'a person actually engaged in business was seen with an equipage of his own'" Marx adds only one phrase to this "What would the good Dr Aikin say if he could rise from his grave and see the Manchester of today?"<sup>54</sup>

Times had changed If in the conditions of undeveloped capitalism parsimony was a prescribed feature of the bourgeois way of life, with the development of capitalism, extravagance, the lavish spending of unearned income, becomes an equally prescribed feature of that way of life Extravagance enters into the expenses of production Each entrepreneur tries to appear richer than he actually is—this facilitates the conduct of his business, broadens his credit opportunities, etc In these circumstances the notorious "abstinence theory," by which vulgar political economy tried to justify incomes derived from exploitation, looks ludicrous, pitiful, stupid Marx pokes fun at these "abstinence" fables He quotes from Nassau William Senior and other vulgar economists, who sound utterly idiotic, because they ascribe to agents of capitalist production a behavior completely alien to them

"All the conditions for carrying on the labor process are suddenly converted into so many acts of abstinence on the part of the capitalist If the corn is not all eaten, but part of it also sown—abstinence of the capitalist If the wine gets time to mature—abstinence of the capitalist The capitalist robs his own self, whenever he 'lends (') the instruments of production to the laborer,' that is, whenever by incorporating labor power with them, he uses them to extract surplus value out of that labor power, instead of eating them up, steam-engines, cotton,

railways, manure, horses, and all, or, as the vulgar economist childishly puts it, instead of dissipating 'their value' in luxuries and other articles of consumption" <sup>55</sup>

Marx puts to rout the inventions of defenders of the exploitative order who tried to make it appear that the wealth of the capitalists and the misery of the workers was something ordained by God. From the utterances of the agents of capitalist production themselves—practicing capitalists, politicians, public figures in bourgeois society—he adduces considerable testimony to the fact that capitalism ruthlessly robs the worker not only of his time, but even of his very life. In one place he cites testimony to the fact that in the English textile industry in the ninety years following the industrial revolution the propertied classes went through three generations while the working class passed through nine generations<sup>1</sup>

In the twenty-third chapter [Ch XXV] Marx quotes an interesting admission of Joseph Chamberlain, at that time Mayor of Birmingham\* "Dr Lee, Medical Officer of Health for Manchester, stated 'that the average age at death of the Manchester upper middle class was thirty-eight years, while the average age at death of the laboring class was seventeen, while at Liverpool those figures were represented as thirty-five against fifteen. It thus appeared that the well-to-do classes had a lease of life which was more than double the value of that which fell to the lot of the less favored citizens' " <sup>56</sup>

In the chapter on the general law of capitalist accumulation Marx shows how the evolution of capitalist relations is reflected and refracted in the writings of the economists. He begins his enumeration with an economist of the eighteenth century, the Venetian monk Ortes, who "regards the antagonism of capitalist production as a general natural law of social wealth" Ortes wrote "In the economy of a nation, advantages and evils always

\* From Chamberlain's speech at a Sanitary Congress in 1875—*Tr*

balance one another the abundance of wealth with some people is always equal to the want of it with others " 57

Further on Marx quotes the "Church of England parson" Townsend, who "in a thoroughly brutal way glorified misery as a necessary condition of wealth "

Marx concludes his review of this question with the following paragraph

"Finally Destutt de Tracy, the fish-blooded bourgeois doctrinaire, blurts out brutally 'In poor nations the people are comfortable, in rich nations they are generally poor ' " 58

The characterizations of bourgeois economists that are strewn through the pages of *Capital* are usually extremely sharp and expressive In some instances Marx is very restrained and sparing of words, but this very restraint, sometimes even carried to the point of exaggerated politeness, underlines all the more the senselessness and emptiness of the assertions of the vulgar economists In other instances, where the need arises, where it is a question of dishonest people, bribed servants of reaction, Marx gives free rein to his anger He gives such characterizations, such eloquent, though brief, literary portraits, that the person appears before the reader as though he were alive

The thirteenth chapter [Ch XV] is devoted to the development of machinery and large-scale industry Marx begins it with a quotation from John Stuart Mill At that time Mill was an outstanding economist who considered himself the rightful heir of Adam Smith and David Ricardo The passage, taken by Marx from Mill's *Principles of Political Economy*, reads "It is questionable if all the mechanical inventions yet made have lightened the day's toil of any human being " 59 To this Marx remarks "That is, however, by no means the aim of the capitalistic application of machinery " Marx explains further that the capitalist is interested in machinery, not as a means of lightening human labor, but as a means of expanding value To the quotation from Mill, Marx appends a very characteristic footnote "Mill should have said, 'of any human being not

fed by other people's labor,' for without doubt, machinery has greatly increased the number of well-to-do idlers "

Marx ridicules the vulgar economists who try to make it appear that although, to be sure, machinery does produce certain inconveniences, still these inconveniences are temporary and cannot justify an outcry against the machines, since this would be to renounce any sort of social progress in general. Marx quotes the tirade of the cutthroat and bandit, Bill Sykes, well-known hero of Dickens' novel *Oliver Twist*

"Gentlemen of the jury, no doubt the throat of this commercial traveler has been cut. But that is not my fault, it is the fault of the knife. Must we, for such a temporary inconvenience, abolish the use of the knife? Only consider! where would agriculture and trade be without the knife? Is it not as salutary in surgery, as it is knowing in anatomy? And in addition a willing help at the festive board? If you abolish the knife—you hurl us back into the depths of barbarism."<sup>60</sup>

Just as the bandit, having cut someone's throat, tries to lodge the blame on the knife, so the capitalist, who exploits workers with the aid of machinery, assures us that the misery of the masses is only a temporary and unavoidable inconvenience, and that to deny oneself the use of machinery on account of this would be to renounce progress. We know perfectly well that Marx was not proposing to renounce the use of machinery, he was only clearly delimiting the role of the machinery by itself on the one hand, and the nature of the capitalist application of machinery on the other.

He showed that all the miseries of the working class derive, not from machinery by itself—just as the knife did not cut the man's throat by itself—but they derive from the capitalist application of machinery. After the replacement of capitalism by socialism, machinery is transformed from a means of exploiting the workers to a means of lightening labor, a means for gigantic and rapid social progress in general as well as for the progress of technique in particular.



Marx exposes the vulgar economists in their glorification of the slavery of wage labor. In order to etch his thought more sharply, he draws an interesting parallel between them and the writers of antiquity. He reminds the reader that the greatest thinker of antiquity, Aristotle, who justified slavery, argued that if tools could work of themselves, if the weavers' looms could move themselves without the aid of another force, if [adds Leontiev—*Tr*] boats could move without the aid of oars, then there would be no need of the social institution of slavery. Antipater, a Greek poet of the time of Cicero, hailed the appearance of the water mill, expressing the hope that it would accomplish the work for which slave labor had formerly been used. As Antipater saw it,\* the water mill was "the giver of freedom to female slaves, and the bringer back of the golden age." After citing Antipater, Marx remarks

"Oh! those heathens! They understood, as the learned Bastiat, and before him the still wiser McCulloch have discovered, nothing of political economy and Christianity. They did not, for example, comprehend that machinery is the surest means of lengthening the working day. They perhaps excused the slavery of one on the ground that it was a means to the full development of another. But to preach slavery of the masses, in order that a few crude and half-educated parvenus might become 'eminent spinners,' 'extensive sausage-makers,' and 'influential shoe-black dealers,' to do this, they lacked the bump of Christianity."<sup>61</sup>

Vulgar political economy extols its own commodity—capitalism. With deadly sarcasm Marx characterizes the defenders of bourgeois society. Let us cite one example.

The subject of discussion is the writer Edmund Burke. Burke was one of the opponents of the French bourgeois revolution,

\* Leontiev says here, "Antipater wrote that" but the phrase he quotes is Marx's, not Antipater's. See the passage cited, where a translation of the poem is given in a footnote—*Tr*

a man who enjoyed great influence in English reactionary circles Marx characterizes him in the following fashion "This sycophant who, in the pay of the English oligarchy, played the romantic *laudator temporis acti* [eulogizer of the past—*Tr*] against the French Revolution, just as, in the pay of the North American Colonies, at the beginning of the American troubles, he had played the Liberal against the English oligarchy, was an out and out vulgar bourgeois 'The laws of commerce are the laws of Nature, and therefore the laws of God'" And Marx adds "No wonder that, true to the laws of God and Nature, he always sold himself in the best market"<sup>62</sup>

Marx struck with special force at the obtuse, boastful, and ignorant German university science—those German philistines in scholar's caps In their stupidity, propensity for plagiarism, and reactionary spirit are reflected the repulsive features of the German lower middle class—flabby, servile toward Prussian junkerdom, hostile to all freedom-loving ideas The reactionary German official "science" that is subjected to annihilating criticism in *Capital* is one of the "intellectual" sources of the cannibal ideology of Hitlerism

In the postscript to the second edition of the first volume of *Capital* Marx explains the historical reasons why the German economists proved to be "mere schoolboys, imitators and followers, petty retailers and hawkers in the service of the great foreign wholesale concern"<sup>63</sup>

Among the German economists of that time Wilhelm Roscher gets probably the most attention in *Capital* Marx shows his complete nullity and the absurdity of his backward views, in which is reflected the backwardness of Germany at that time in economic, political and spiritual matters In a footnote to the first volume of *Capital* we read.

"Professor Roscher claims to have discovered that one needlewoman employed by Mrs Roscher during two days does more work than two needlewomen employed together during one day The learned professor should not study the capitalist process

of production in the nursery, nor under circumstances where the principal personage, the capitalist, is wanting”<sup>64</sup>

An absurd, unscientific approach to the solution of all problems of political economy is characteristic of Roscher. This recognized authority of official German science of the time is, moreover, a typical plagiarist: he adorns himself with other people’s feathers, selecting objects for borrowing to suit his level. In one place Marx mentions the English vulgar economists Ure and Senior and their pitiful German imitators such as Roscher and others. Of the propensity of the German professors for plagiarism Marx says: “It is because Condillac has not the remotest idea of the nature of exchange value that he has been chosen by Herr Professor Wilhelm Roscher as a proper person to answer for the soundness of his own childish notions”<sup>65</sup>

In another place Marx points out that Roscher “seldom loses an occasion of registering, in black and white, ingenious apologetic fancies”<sup>66</sup>

Roscher’s views are distinguished by their great confusion: his head crawls with snatches of various hastily plucked contradictory theoretical systems. In particular, on the question of the role of nature in the creation of value Roscher tried to get by with the meaningless and absurd reservation that, forsooth, nature produces “scarcely any” exchange values. Apropos of this Marx remarks: “Mr Roscher’s ‘Nature’ and the exchange value it produces are rather like the foolish virgin who admitted indeed that she had had a child, but ‘it was such a little one’”<sup>67</sup>

If with Roscher value is partly created by nature, then, naturally, according to his notion, surplus value owes its formation to the “abstention” of the capitalist. In connection with this revelation on the part of the accepted head of German university learning Marx gives the following deadly characterization of the whole essence of Roscher’s theoretical constructs.

“What is it that makes such men as Roscher account for the origin of surplus value by a mere *réchauffé* [warming over,

rehash—*Tr*] of the more or less plausible excuses by the capitalist for his appropriation of surplus value? It is, besides their real ignorance, their apologetic dread of a scientific analysis of value and surplus value, and of obtaining a result possibly not altogether palatable to the powers that be”<sup>68</sup>

Such characterizations occur rather often in *Capital*. Marx is ruthless to the obscurantism, reaction, and cupidity of the propertied class.

At the same time, however, it would be the greatest slander to assert that Marx was always hating everyone. This sort of slander is an invention of the opponents of Marxism and is the easiest of all to refute. Not to mention the fact that Marx throughout his life showed the greatest tact and solicitude toward party comrades and companions in the struggle, or the fact that often, while himself suffering the greatest need, he gave away his last pennies to émigrés whose need was even greater—it must be borne in mind that in *Capital* and elsewhere Marx referred with the greatest respect to several public figures and thinkers, both of past epochs and among his own contemporaries, whom he held in high esteem. Let us but recall how Marx described Aristotle as the “greatest thinker of antiquity,” how he appraised such people as Petty, Smith, Ricardo, how he speaks of a noble friend of the working class, the factory inspector Leonard Horner, who by his truthful descriptions of the conditions of the English working class gave no small assistance to the struggle of the proletariat.

What Marx valued in people before everything else was honesty and incorruptibility. He always drew a sharp line between honest people and people who had entered the service of enthroned reaction, the hired scribes of the bourgeoisie, who consciously distorted the real state of affairs because they had been bribed to do this by the bourgeoisie. The bought agents of the bourgeoisie were mercilessly branded by Marx in the pages of *Capital*. But people of integrity, who genuinely and honestly tried to penetrate to the essence of things, to describe the laws

of capitalist production, even though not always with success, Marx held in high esteem, he criticized their errors, pointed out the shortcomings of their investigation, but at the same time noted with great satisfaction each grain of truth which these investigators had contributed to science by their works. A stranger to everything doctrinaire, and far from indulging in sectarian exclusiveness, Marx, both in the sphere of science and in the sphere of practical political struggle, resolutely supported all progressive forces, all progressive-minded, freedom-loving people who were ready to do battle honestly against the forces of obscurantism and reaction. We may recall his attitude to Abraham Lincoln, who headed the progressive camp in the United States during the Civil War of 1861-1865. We may recall his attitude toward leaders of the struggle for national liberation of the European peoples, among whom many were very far away from the socialist movement and its aims. Without the slightest hesitation Marx allied himself with all who were honestly and truly ready to enter the battle against the attempts of reaction to assert its domination.

## CHAPTER III

### Principal Milestones in Marx's Work on *Capital*

Marx was fully justified in calling *Capital* his life work. His labor on it covered approximately four decades. From the moment he began to study political economy (fall of 1843) up until his death (March 14, 1883), he did not halt his work on *Capital*.

The monumental edifice was erected by Marx literally stone by stone. For the erection of this amazing edifice Marx raised an enormous scaffolding. The preliminary manuscripts written by Marx during the period of his work on *Capital* are several times more voluminous than the final text of *Capital* in the form in which it was published. But besides these manuscripts, Marx left a multitude of extracts from books and sources of various kinds, copied out while he was at work on *Capital*.

A person admiring a remarkable work of architecture shows no particular interest in the scaffolding with whose aid the building was erected. It is a different matter in science. In order to achieve a deeper, fuller, more many-sided comprehension and perception of a scientific production in its finished form, it is exceedingly important to know the principal steps of the origin and creation of the work, to take a look at the author's laboratory. And if this is correct with regard to any large-scale scientific endeavor constituting an epoch in the development

of one or another science, it is especially correct and especially important with regard to *Capital*

When we acquaint ourselves with the course of Marx's work on *Capital*, much becomes clearer, much is presented in a new light, our comprehension of *Capital* grows richer and more profound

Marx's work on *Capital* can be divided into four principal periods. The first period embraces the 1840's right up to the revolution of 1848,\* during it Marx and Engels acted as guides and leaders of the first communist party of the proletariat in world history—the Communist League † This period embraces mainly the years of Marx's first exile, when he lived for the most part in France and Belgium and spent a short time in England

The second period embraces the years beginning with the defeat of the revolution of 1848—a defeat that forced Marx to set out on his second, his London exile—and ending with the publication of *A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy* in 1859. Thus this period takes in the next decade

The third period embraces the time after the publication of

\* In 1848 bourgeois revolutions took place in Paris, Berlin, and Vienna. The Paris revolution was the first to break out (February) and was also distinguished from the others by the fact that in Paris in June 1848 "the first great battle was fought between the two classes that split modern society" (Marx). During this period (1848-1849) Marx returned to his native Rhineland to edit the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung*, a revolutionary democratic newspaper published in Cologne, and Engels took part in the actual fighting in Germany. See Frederick Engels, *Germany: Revolution and Counter-Revolution*, Karl Marx, *The Class Struggles in France*—Tr

† The Communist League was founded in London in June 1847 as an international society for the propagation of the ideas of scientific communism. Marx and Engels were commissioned to draw up its program, the famous *Manifesto of the Communist Party*, which was first published in February 1848. The League continued in existence until 1852. See Frederick Engels, "The History of the Communist League" in *Karl Marx: Selected Works*, Vol. II—Tr

the *Critique of Political Economy*, up to the appearance of the first volume of *Capital* in 1867

And, finally, the fourth period embraces the time from the publication of the first volume of *Capital* until Marx's death

## 1 THE 1840's

In the preface to the *Critique of Political Economy* Marx briefly describes the course of his studies in economic science. He points out that he had specialized in juridical sciences, in connection with which he studied history and philosophy. In the German universities where Marx received his training, political economy was at that time held in disregard. An impetus for the study of political economy was provided for Marx by the circumstance that as early as 1842, as editor of the *Rheinische Zeitung*,\* he came in contact with the sphere of "so-called material interests." In order to acquire the proper facility in this sphere, of which up to that time he had not made a special study, Marx decided to turn to the study of political economy.

Marx realized his new-found intention after his transfer to Paris, in October 1843. Having plunged head first into the seething life of the revolutionary organizations, and while carrying on a study of the history of the French Revolution and French socialism, Marx now came to grips with the study of political economy. At this time Marx had already become a revolutionary, addressing his critique of the existing order to the proletarian masses. This position is quite plainly expressed in his "Introduction to a Critique of the Hegelian Philosophy of Law."<sup>1</sup>

"The intercourse with Engels undoubtedly contributed to the decision of Marx to make a study of political economy, the

\**Rheinish Gazette*, spokesman of bourgeois liberal opinion published in the Rhineland. Marx was chief editor from October 1842 to March 1843, when the paper was suppressed by the Prussian government.—Tr



science in which his works produced a whole revolution"<sup>2</sup> Engels turned his attention to political economy somewhat earlier than Marx. His "Outline of a Critique of Political Economy"—a work valued highly by Marx—was published in 1844.

Marx began to study political economy in 1843. In 1843-1844 he undertook a fundamental examination, making numerous extracts and notes, of the works of Smith, Ricardo, Jean-Baptiste Say, Sismondi, Buret, Pecqueur, Skarbek, James Mill, McCulloch, and other economists. The English economists he had to read in French translation, since at that time he had not yet learned English, which later, during the long London exile, was to become for Marx a second native tongue.

The study of economic literature continued after he moved to Brussels (February 1845) and proceeded with particular intensity during his joint trip with Engels to Manchester (July-August 1845), where the two together read W. Petty, T. Tooke, Cooper, Cobbett, and others.

In this period Marx was already writing a "Critique of Politics and National Economy." From the parts of this work that have been preserved and partly published one may judge that already here Marx had in view a survey of a broad range of problems. The work was to contain sections on wages, profit, land rent, the alienation of labor, *et al*. At the beginning of February 1845 Marx contracted with a Darmstadt publisher, a certain Leske, for the publication of his book, which was expected to consist of two volumes of more than twenty printer's sheets\* each. But later Marx withdrew from this project. The reason for his withdrawal he stated in a letter to the publisher dated August 1, 1846:

"The fact is, it seemed to me extremely important to *preface* my *positive* exposition of the subject with a polemical work directed against German philosophy and against the *German*

\* One printer's sheet=16 page signature—Tr

*socialism* that has existed since that time. This is necessary in order to prepare the public for the point of view of a political economy that is in direct opposition to German science as it has existed up to the present"

In other words, Marx had decided that, before giving the reader a "critique of political economy," it would be necessary to give an account of the fundamentals of his own method. With this purpose he and Engels set about writing a work that was published many years later in the Soviet Union, after the death of Marx and of Engels. I refer to the *German Ideology*,<sup>3</sup> in which Marx and Engels, as we are informed in the preface to the *Critique of Political Economy*, decided "to settle our accounts with our former philosophic conscience," in other words, they decided to break with the idealist tendency in philosophy to which they had been attached in their early years, and for the first time they gave an account of the materialist conception of history—discovered and formulated by them—and of dialectical materialism in general.

As is known, the fate of *The German Ideology* was exceedingly peculiar. After it had been written, its publication did not materialize and its authors, in Marx's words, left the manuscript "to the gnawing criticism of mice." According to the testimony of Marx, the authors decided on this severe verdict in consequence of the fact that their main purpose—clarification of the question for their own selves—had been achieved. Fortunately, the mice did not carry out their criticism seriously enough to prevent the survival of the work, and it was possible to print it later.

The first period of Marx's study of political economy—the mid-1840's—thus coincided with years during which Marx and Engels, in a resolute struggle with all tendencies of petty bourgeois socialism, worked out the foundations of their own world outlook. From the very foundations of the Marxist world outlook, from the materialist conception of history, there naturally flowed a tremendous interest in economic questions. In a

brief biographical sketch on Marx, Lenin points out "Having recognized that the economic system is the foundation on which the political superstructure is erected, Marx devoted most attention to the study of this economic system"<sup>4</sup>

From this time on until the end of his life Marx did not halt his studies of political economy. In the course of four years of intensive pursuit of this subject (1843-1847), Marx filled, in his characteristic small handwriting, twenty-four notebooks on political economy, in volume amounting to 140 printer's sheets. Thus, during these years he wrote twice as much as is contained in the text of the first volume of *Capital*. Summarized in these notebooks are works by seventy different authors. Marx made particularly detailed summaries of books on the economic sciences: Guelich's *Historical Account of Trade, Industry and Agriculture*, Buret's *Condition of the Working Class in England and France*, John Wade's *History of the Middle and Working Classes*, and others. Thus Marx came to the task of working out the foundations of his own theory well armed with concrete historical knowledge.

The works published by Marx in the second half of the 1840's, in the first place such works as *The Poverty of Philosophy*, *Wage-Labor and Capital*, and especially the *Manifesto of the Communist Party*, show that about this time—toward the end of the 1840's—Marx already knew quite well not only the source of surplus value, but even how it is created.

Evidence of this is found in *The Poverty of Philosophy*, where Marx sharply criticized the reactionary doctrine of the petty bourgeois socialist Proudhon. While exposing the profoundly contradictory nature of Proudhon's theories, Marx at the same time clearly and profoundly formulated the opposition between the class interests of bourgeoisie and proletariat, the economic foundations of this opposition, and the inevitability of the sharpening of class contradictions in bourgeois society.

Especially interesting is Marx's *Wage-Labor and Capital*. This was a publication of lectures delivered to German émigré

workers in Brussels, where at that time Marx was living in exile. It is one of the few works by Marx in which he played the role of popularizer. It shows that Marx possessed an enormous talent for popularization. He knew how to expound the most complicated questions in the most accessible form. To the present day *Wage-Labor and Capital* is an unexcelled model of popularization of the economic foundations of Marxism. However, it must be borne in mind that at that time Marx was still far from having elaborated his doctrine in all its component parts. In this work there are several postulates which, as Marx's doctrine was further developed, were dropped and replaced by others. In particular, Marx did not here carry through the distinction between labor power and labor.

Thus, at the time of the revolution of 1848, Marx already appears as a man of tremendous knowledge in the field of political economy.

A work of genius in its depth and brilliance, its simplicity and clarity, is the sketch of the contradictions of bourgeois society and the basic tendencies of its development presented by Marx and Engels in the first programmatic document of international communism—the *Communist Manifesto* which Comrade Stalin is fully justified in calling the “song of songs of Marxism.” In this work is shown with exceptional profundity the historical mission of capitalism, which is that capitalism develops gigantic productive forces in society and, at the same time, is not capable of utilizing these productive forces for the satisfaction of social wants. In this work is shown the antagonism between proletariat and bourgeoisie, the internal contradictions of capitalism, which are revealed with special force in the anarchy of production and in crises. The world-wide historical role of the proletariat as the gravedigger of capitalism and the creator of a new, socialist society is expressed with tremendous power.

The enemies of Marxism tried, and still try, to hold up the *Communist Manifesto* as a work in which, they assert, Marx

and Engels were still paying tribute to the revolutionary enthusiasm of their youth, as opposed to their other works, principally to *Capital*. But this is wasted effort. As a matter of fact, the basic conclusions with which the *Communist Manifesto* is studded form the foundation of *Capital*, and, conversely, *Capital* is the further indestructible proof of the basic postulates already formulated in the *Communist Manifesto*.

## 2 FROM THE REVOLUTION OF 1848 TO THE PUBLICATION OF *THE CRITIQUE* *OF POLITICAL ECONOMY*

After the defeat of the 1848 revolution, when Marx and Engels were forced to go into exile, they decided to concentrate their efforts on elaborating the revolutionary theory of the working class, in order to furnish the working class with a theoretical weapon. Marx deliberately kept aloof from participation in émigré squabbles and brawls. He begrudged the amount of his time which even so was taken up by these squabbles. He concentrated most of his energy on the elaboration of political economy, on the creation of his basic theoretical work.

This was the period of Marx's London exile. As he indicates in the preface to the *Critique of Political Economy*, London served Marx as an "observation point", here he had the opportunity to examine everything that went on in the bourgeois world. London was then the generally acknowledged capital of the capitalist world. It was the economic, political, and intellectual center of a country which at that time still held firmly and tightly in its hands a monopoly of the world market. It was the capital of the richest country of the world. And it was in this city that Marx had to overcome the greatest obstacles and endure inhumanly heavy privations during the many years of stubborn labor on the creation of his fundamental work.

The correspondence of Marx and Engels shows how many were the privations and wants Marx had to live through at this

period Only the iron, inflexible will of the proletarian revolutionary won victory for Marx in this unequal struggle

Formally speaking, Marx enjoyed full freedom of action in London—he was not put in prison or sent into penal servitude, his writings were not even subjected to censorship, as happened, for instance, to revolutionaries in tsarist Russia But this “freedom” meant for Marx the “freedom” to starve to death The threat of poverty and hunger continually hung over him and caused him innumerable difficulties In one of the letters Marx says “I must pursue my purpose through thick and thin, and I cannot allow bourgeois society to convert me into a money-making machine” [Marx to Weydemeyer, Feb 1, 1859]

Actually, bourgeois society would doubtless have showered him with money, would have set him up on a pedestal and created exceedingly favorable living conditions for him, if he had renounced his purpose, if he had become, let us say, a journalist acceptable to the bourgeoisie, allowing himself to criticize the imperfections of social life, while remaining within the framework of the existing order This was a way out that would have freed him of all life’s privations and burdens But Marx categorically rejected this road, he took another road, tying in his fate with the working class, and he walked on this road to the end of his life A very important condition of Marx’s triumph on this road was the circumstance that Engels decided to devote part of his time to a job which he detested and which he himself termed “filthy commerce”\* He took this job in order to enable Marx to work on *Capital* and continue his existence

Engels systematically provided Marx with material assistance But this support was not enough Marx was often forced to interrupt his studies in order to find some sort of occasional

\* From about 1850 until 1865 Engels worked as an employee in his father’s firm, Ermen & Engels, in Manchester After 1865 he was a partner in the firm, and in 1870 he retired and settled in London, near Marx—Tr

employment, to execute some literary task or other And with all this, again and again his circumstances proved exceedingly difficult

For instance, in his letters we find such complaints as the following

"Again I'm as hungry as a hawk"

"Complete absence of coal in our rooms I'd rather lie 100 leagues under the earth than vegetate like this"

In his letters to Engels, his closest friend and colleague, he sometimes wrote without restraint

"My wife declares she wishes she were lying in her grave with her children they live only in fear" [June 18, 1862]\*

Want struck painfully at Marx's family, and he felt these blows sharpest of all In 1857 a baby girl was born to Marx, and there was not enough money in the family to buy her a cradle The child lived a year, and then died, and again, there was no money to buy her a coffin

"I have for the time being insured myself against the danger of being thrown out of the lodgings by giving the landlord a promissory note," Marx writes to Engels in August [8], 1851

The difficult conditions of his life—constant overexertion, anxiety for the family, night work—prematurely undermined Marx's powerful organism He began to be tormented by liver trouble Several years later this was followed by carbuncles, which tortured him during the whole time he was working on *Capital* When Engels read the first chapter of *Capital* he jokingly remarked to Marx that this chapter showed the effects of the carbuncles Marx replied, also jokingly "I hope the bourgeoisie will remember my carbuncles all the rest of their lives"<sup>5</sup>

In spite of the fact that Marx found strength to joke about

\* Letters which are not available in English sources are identified by their dates set in square brackets wherever possible, so that the reader may look them up in other collections—T<sub>r</sub>

his hardships, they weighed very heavily on him. For instance, a short time before the publication of *Capital*, in 1866, his illness was so aggravated that he wrote [to Engels, February 10] "This time it was a matter of life and death. The chief cause of this relapse is *excessive night work*."

Marx snatched hours from recreation and sleep, in order to fulfill his duty to the working class, in order to create a theoretical weapon for the working class. He worked literally without letup. He took his first "leave" in 1866, approximately twenty years after the beginning of his titanic socio-political struggle. This happened at a time when illness threatened to end his life, and Engels persuaded him to go to the seashore to rest.

The conditions under which the ailing Marx had to undergo treatment were extremely difficult. In one letter he writes [to Engels, January 8, 1868], "To live according to their [the doctors'—*AL*] prescriptions one must be a *rentier* and not as poor as a church-mouse devil like me."

It was under conditions of this sort that Marx had to work on *Capital*. In 1853 [August 18], he wrote to Engels "Three-quarters of my time goes to scurrying after pennies." "I was forced to kill a day working for pay," he complains in a letter of December 21, 1857.

Two months later he said again:

"I am not the master of my own time but rather a servant. I only have the night left over for myself and this night work again is disturbed by very frequent attacks and recurrences of liver trouble."<sup>6</sup>

In a letter to Engels he wrote [July 15, 1858]:

"My greatest rage is to think that on account of the worst trivialities my intellect may be ruined and my ability to work destroyed."

These numerous testimonies by Marx—and their number could be further multiplied—give a picture of the surroundings in which he had to produce his work of genius.



Even after the last part of the manuscript of the first volume had been given to the publisher, Marx wrote, on April 30, 1867, to one of his adherents, the mining engineer Siegfried Meyer, explaining his delay in answering Meyer's letter

" I had to use *every* moment in which I was capable of work in order that I might finish the task to which I have sacrificed my health, my happiness in life and my family I hope this explanation requires no further supplement I laugh at the so-called 'practical' men and their wisdom If one chose to be an ox one could of course turn one's back on the agonies of mankind and look after one's own skin But I should really have regarded myself as *unpractical* if I had pegged out without completely finishing my book, at least in manuscript "

Want oppressed Marx and fretted away all his strength, real heroism and the greatest exertion were needed to emerge victorious from this unequal struggle against exhaustion, against starvation

What was the course of Marx's work on *Capital* during this period—the period between the revolution of 1848 and the publication of *A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy*?

As an émigré in London Marx resumed his studies of political economy in the autumn of 1850 He studied mostly in the British Museum He would arrive there as soon as the museum was opened for the public At that time the British Museum was undoubtedly the richest library in the world Marx used to leave the library only when the employees put out the lights Again he studied in detail the English economists, this time not in French, but in English

Already in 1851, after a thorough re-examination of Adam Smith and David Ricardo, Marx came to the conclusion that essentially, since the time of these greatest representatives of bourgeois classical political economy, there had not been any progress in the sphere of this science, with the exception of

valuable studies on special, concrete questions. Later on he more than once repeated this conclusion of his, which was based on the most careful study of the subject. And yet it is highly characteristic that Marx's only correction to this severe but justified verdict on the economic literature of his time was made with respect to works by Russian economists—Flerovsky and Chernyshevsky, the latter of whom he held in particularly high esteem.

Marx studied a wide range of literature, dealing for the most part with concrete branches of learning. During this period he read the works of Tooke, Fullarton, Torrens, Garnier, Senior, Peel. He studied a wide range of literature on the history of money, beginning with deep antiquity, he traced the whole story of the history of the development of money. He studied everything there was on the theory of rent. In this connection Marx felt the need to familiarize himself with agricultural chemistry and geology. He studied these sciences with the thoroughness and soundness that were characteristic of him. Further, his attention and interest were attracted by problems of population and colonial history, the seizure, settlement, economic life, trade, etc., of the colonies. Simultaneously with these subjects he studied the English philosophers Locke and Hume and the Ricardian socialists Gray, Hodgskin, Ravenstone.

He studied a very vast and rich literature on economic history, and, supplementary to this, he studied the contemporary economic scene in newspaper and journalistic material, especially the English journal *The Economist*, which was the most serious and enlightened organ of the specialized press. The number of notebooks grew with enormous rapidity. Again and again he summarized the literature, the newspapers, cut clippings, and pasted them into his notebooks.

Even while working hard over the economic literature, Marx still found time for popular lectures on political economy, which in 1850-1851 he gave before an audience of workers. In the crowded hall of the German Communist Workers' Edu-

cational Society in London, Marx expounded in clear and comprehensible language the basic elements of his doctrine. Marx passionately hated any vulgarization of science. His language was clear, and this clarity of exposition was the natural result of clarity of profound and thorough thought.

Wilhelm Liebknecht, who attended these lectures, tells in his reminiscences of Marx about the pedagogical method applied by the great teacher of the working class. Marx put his thoughts into short, understandable phrases, avoiding any expressions that might be incomprehensible to the workers. More difficult propositions he explained in detail. Then he proposed that questions be put to him. After answering these, he in turn asked his listeners questions, which he put with the aim of checking as to whether the lecture had been mastered by the audience.

During the years 1850-1851 Marx filled eighteen large notebooks with his extracts and digests. At this time it seemed to him that he was already on the verge of completing his work. On April 2, 1851, he told Engels in a letter that he reckoned on finishing writing his economic work, which was to consist of three volumes, in the course of five weeks. At the end of June 1851 Marx wrote to his friend Weydemeyer:

"From nine in the morning until seven in the evening I am usually in the British Museum. The material on which I am working is so devilishly extensive that, in spite of all exertions, I shall not manage to finish the work before six-eight weeks, besides this there is the continued addition of every possible practical hindrance, inevitable in the London surroundings in which one has to vegetate here. But in spite of everything, the affair moves swiftly to its conclusion. Come what may, one must call a halt sometime" (Marx to Weydemeyer, June 27, 1851.)

Actually the work required far more time and far greater efforts than Marx supposed in 1851. How is this miscalculation—if one may call it that—to be explained?

The fact of the matter was that Marx was breaking virgin soil, he was literally erecting a new edifice. For before him there was no proletarian political economy. He was the first to create a theoretical weapon for the proletariat. He did this job with tremendous conscientiousness, with tremendous scientific scrupulousness, and in doing it he made the greatest demands on himself, practiced the greatest (as we would say now) self-criticism. Naturally, when he seemed to be near the completion of his work, fresh questions constantly arose before him. Months and years of intensive, fundamental, tenacious work were required for the solution of these questions.

If one adds to this the difficult surroundings in which Marx had to produce his work, it will become clear that the time actually required by the task must be considered, not excessively long, but, on the contrary, exceedingly short. Its accomplishment in this time was possible only because Marx worked with all his energy.

After the beginning of the 1850's there was some interruption in Marx's work on political economy. Again and again he was forced by want to tear himself away from his basic labors and allot a considerable portion of his time to working for pay. He wrote a great number of articles for the New York *Tribune*, among them, in the first place, articles "on important economic events in England and on the continent"<sup>8</sup>. The march of political events—in particular, the *coup d'état* of Louis Bonaparte\*—also caused interruptions in his work on economic investigations. Marx wrote many articles, pamphlets, conducted a stubborn struggle against all forces of reaction, unmasked its agents, the spies and provocateurs operating in the midst of the revolutionary emigration.

Beginning approximately with the year 1856, Marx again

\* On the occasion of the *coup d'état* of December 2, 1851, Marx wrote his famous *Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte*, first published in New York in 1852 by his friend Joseph Weydemeyer—Tr

came to grips with his economic work. He was first to sense the approach of the crisis of 1857. He connected definite revolutionary perspectives with this crisis, and he wanted to finish his theoretical book before the moment arrived when the revolution would begin and there would be no more time for writing theoretical works. During this period he again began intensive work on political economy. In 1856 Marx reread his notebooks, made selections from them, and renewed his daily ten-hour sessions in the British Museum, hurrying to finish the task before the arrival of decisive events.

At the end of 1857 he wrote to Engels: "I am working like mad all through the nights at putting my economic studies together so that I may at least have the outlines clear before the deluge comes."<sup>9</sup>

"I am doing a colossal amount of work," he says in a later letter [December 18, 1857], "mostly until four in the morning."

However, although he hurried to publish the work before the arrival of revolutionary events, Marx did not in the slightest degree slacken his scientific conscientiousness and carefulness. Before writing out the text for publication, he wrote extensive monographs. In 1857-1858 he wrote several notebooks full of such monographs, the volume of which material amounted to more than fifty printer's sheets. The content of these manuscripts, as he indicates in a letter to Engels [December 18, 1857], represented "an elaboration of economic theory in its fundamental features."

These monographs, written by Marx not for publication but for his own use, have been published only recently. The first volume, a bulky book 750 pages long, came out in 1940, in the original language.

What sort of questions are taken up in this manuscript?

Here are taken up all the basic problems dealt with in *Capital*, moreover, not only in the first volume, but also in the later ones: the commodity, money (both its origin and its

functions), the conversion of money into capital, the essence of surplus value, the two forms of surplus value, capital accumulation, the circulation of capital, the conversion of surplus value into profit and of value into price of production, problems of credit, interest, the decline in the rate of profit, etc. Thus even a listing of the questions taken up in the manuscript of 1857-1858 shows that its contents are exceptionally rich. Particularly noteworthy is the fact that in this work Marx provides the solution of the problem of the average rate of profit. It is especially important to emphasize this for the following reason. When the third volume of *Capital* came out in 1894, bourgeois scholars set up a unanimous howl to the effect that here Marx was leading the reader by the nose, that the theory of prices given by him in the third volume contradicted the theory of value expounded in the first volume. Enemies of Marxism set in motion a slanderous outcry about the so-called "contradiction" between the first and third volumes of *Capital*. This slanderous invention of bourgeois scholars, besides being nonsense theoretically, was also nonsense from the factual standpoint, since the manuscript of the third volume of *Capital* had been written by Marx in 1865, *i.e.*, even before the first volume was published (1867). The manuscript of 1857-1858 makes it possible to assert that already at this period, *i.e.*, a decade before the publication of the first volume of *Capital* and two years before the appearance of the *Critique of Political Economy*, the question of the average rate of profit was perfectly clear to Marx, was already solved by him at that time.

Thus, before presenting for public consideration the first issue of his economic work—*A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy*—Marx wrote a series of monographs whose volume was approximately four or five times greater than that of the *Critique*. It is interesting to note that from the start these monographs were not intended for publication. In writing them Marx pursued a different aim, which, in his own formulation, was the clarification of problems for the writer himself. Both

the character of the exposition and the style of the manuscript of 1857-1858 are conditioned by this purpose. The manuscript is written in the peculiar, mixed language that was typical of Marx in this period. Basically it is in German, but there is a thick scattering of expressions and whole phrases in English and French. When analyzing the works of English authors Marx is more apt to use English, if he writes about works by French authors, he resorts to French. He was a brilliant master of all three languages, which he in fact used like a native.

Characteristically, in view of the growing dimensions of the manuscript, Marx prepared a sort of subject index in order to make the material usable. Topics and problems are written out in the form of chapter headings, after which are indicated the pages of the manuscript on which these matters are discussed.

The extent of Marx's conscientiousness and scientific scrupulousness is indicated by several characteristic details, as witness the following example.

When Marx had the *Critique* all ready for the printer, a book came out in London by an economist, Maclaren, devoted to questions of currency circulation. Even though Marx had studied a wide range of literature—everything previously printed on these questions—he bent all his efforts on obtaining this book. In the British Museum, as often happens in libraries, books were not made available for half a year after their publication, lack of money made it impossible for Marx to buy the book. Then he applied to Engels for help in getting it. Marx studied Maclaren's work and referred to it in the *Critique*.

Before publishing his first volume, Marx worked out in detail the plan of his work as a whole. He wrote down several variants of this plan in preliminary manuscripts, in some of his letters Marx gives the main points. This was a grandiose program of investigation into the "anatomy" of bourgeois society, beginning with its simplest cell—the commodity—and ending with its crowning piece in the form of the world market, generated by the capitalist mode of production. In one of the vari-

ants of the plan, immediately after the world market the following points are noted:

"Crises Disintegration of mode of production and social order based on exchange value Real transformation of individual labor into social labor and vice versa "

Thus, according to this variant, Marx intended in the concluding part of his investigation to take up crises, those heralds of the inevitable downfall of capitalism and conditions of the birth of a socialist society after the destruction of capitalism

The inevitability of the downfall of capitalism and of the victory of the socialist order—these are the ideas that run like a red thread through Marx's economic investigation

In one of his letters to Engels, Marx humorously remarks that although the *Critique of Political Economy* bore the subtitle "Book I—On Capital," there was nothing in it yet about capital, the only subjects taken up here were the commodity (Chapter I) and money (Chapter II) The third chapter, which was to form the content of the next part, Marx intended to devote to capital

In the autumn of 1857 Marx put into one of his notebooks (Notebook M) a brilliant draft (which remained unfinished) of an "Introduction to the Critique of Political Economy", this material he omitted in preparing for publication, "as any anticipation of results that are still to be proven seemed to me objectionable"<sup>10</sup> Already in this draft a general plan of the work as a whole is projected

"The order of treatment must manifestly be as follows first, the general abstract definitions which are more or less applicable to all forms of society, but in the sense indicated above Second, the categories which go to make up the inner organization of bourgeois society and constitute the foundations of the principal classes, capital, wage-labor, landed property, their mutual relations, city and country, the three great social classes, the exchange between them, circulation, credit (private) Third, the organization of bourgeois society in the form of a state, con-



sidered in relation to itself, the 'unproductive' classes, taxes, public debts, public credit, population, colonies, emigration Fourth, the international organization of production, international division of labor, international exchange, import and export, rate of exchange Fifth, the world market and crises"<sup>11</sup>

In other manuscripts of the same period Marx more than once returns to the plan of his work In particular, in Notebook II (1858) two more variants of the plan are sketched, representing a further elaboration and a partial metamorphosis of the plan in Notebook M<sup>12</sup>

In several letters of the years 1858-1859 Marx speaks of the division of his work into six books. capital, landed property, wage labor, the state, foreign trade, the world market (letter to Engels of April 2, 1858, to Lassalle of February 22, 1858, to Weydemeyer of February 1, 1859)<sup>13</sup> The same order is repeated in the preface to the *Critique*

" I do not at all intend, however, to work out in detail all six of the books into which the whole work falls," wrote Marx on March 11, 1858, "in the last three books I want to give only the main outlines, whereas in the first three, which properly contain the development of fundamental economic postulates, it will not always be possible to avoid detailed explanations"

In the same letter he gives the projected size of the whole work as not less than 30-40 printer's sheets In the letter of February 22, 1858, he speaks of further plans

" The critique and history of political economy and socialism as a whole must form the subject of another work Finally, a short *historical* sketch of the development of economic categories and relations—a third work"

The vast wealth of information, on the one hand, and difficulties of a material and publishing nature, on the other hand, caused Marx to decide on publishing the work in separate parts He arrived at this decision reluctantly, after a full reckoning of the inconveniences attendant upon this method of publishing his economic writings.

"The work to which I refer first of all," he writes in one of the letters, "is a *critique of economic categories*, or, if you like, the system of bourgeois economy, critically presented. This is at once an account of the system and a critique of it given in the account itself. Had I the time, tranquillity, and means at my disposal to work up all this as a whole before publication, I would give it in an exceedingly compact shape, since I always liked the method of compact presentation. But in this shape (perhaps more convenient for the comprehension of the public, but certainly detrimental to the form), if it is printed in separate, successive parts, the work will inevitably be somewhat long drawn out."

In March 1859 Marx made a contract with the Berlin publisher Franz Duncker. According to the original plan, the first part was to have six printer's sheets, containing the elaboration of the following themes: commodity, money, capital (the production process of capital, the circulation process of capital, the unity of the two, or capital plus profit and interest).

The work of preparing the first part for the printer actually overflowed into a new, careful, and critical reworking of everything already written. Telling about how matters stood on this work, Marx, in one of his letters, makes the following characteristic observation:

"I have in fact had the final working out in hand for some months. But the thing makes very slow progress because as soon as one tries to come to a final reckoning with questions which one has made the chief object of one's studies for years, they are always revealing new aspects and demanding fresh considera-

Illness again tore Marx from his desk—overexertion resulted in an aggravation of his liver trouble. For some time the work was halted. Marx began to prepare the final manuscript of the first part only in October 1858 and he finished it on January 21, 1859. Marx worked with extraordinary intensity. He was concerned not only with the content, but also with the form of his

*writing* In one of the letters of this period he tells of two reasons he had for not allowing the work to be vitiated in consequence of his illness: "1 It is the result of fifteen years of research, *i.e.*, the best period of my life

"2 This work for the first time gives scientific expression to a view on social relationships that is of great importance Therefore I owe it to the party not to allow the thing to be vitiated by a heavy and wooden manner of writing "

The first part turned out to be nearly 12 printer's sheets long, although it included only the chapters on the commodity and money The third chapter, "On Capital," Marx put off for the following part At the end of January the manuscript was sent to Duncker, at the end of February the preface was sent, and in the first half of June 1859 the book came out in one thousand copies under the title *A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy Book I—On Capital*

During the period of his work on the manuscript of the *Critique* Marx wrote his famous "Introduction to the Critique of Political Economy"\* In this "Introduction" Marx elucidates in compact and condensed form the basic elements of his method—the method of materialist dialectics—as applied to political economy The "Introduction" was not published until many years after Marx's death, when it found a lasting place in the treasury of Marxism as one of the brightest fragments, one of the most profound in its content

As is known, the brilliant preface to the *Critique* is a document of exceptional importance and exceptional significance The material formulated in the preface constitutes the algebra of revolution Here Marx describes the dialectics of the development of productive forces and production relations and sets forth the theoretical principles of the inevitability of social revolution and the dictatorship of the proletariat After recounting the main facts about the course of his work, Marx formulates the "*general result*" at which he had arrived

\* See note 10 above —Tr

"In the social production which men carry on they enter into definite relations that are indispensable and independent of their will, these relations of production correspond to a definite stage of development of their material forces of production. The sum total of these relations of production constitutes the economic structure of society—the real foundation, on which rises a legal and political superstructure and to which correspond definite forms of social consciousness. The mode of production in material life determines the social, political and intellectual life processes in general. It is not the consciousness of men that determines their being, but, on the contrary, their social being that determines their consciousness. At a certain stage of their development, the material forces of production in society come in conflict with the existing relations of production, or—what is but a legal expression for the same thing—with the property relations within which they have been at work before. From forms of development of the forces of production these relations turn into their fetters. Then begins an epoch of social revolution."<sup>15</sup>

The bourgeois social order develops class contradictions to their utmost limit, the gulf between classes deepens as never before. But together with this "the bourgeois relations of production are the last antagonistic form of the social process of production." For "at the same time the productive forces developing in the womb of bourgeois society create the material conditions for the solution of that antagonism."<sup>16</sup>

Marx had to work on the production of his book under exceptionally difficult conditions, while suffering terrible privations and conducting an exceedingly hard struggle for existence. In a letter to Engels Marx observed jokingly that he doubted that any author had ever had to study the theory of money while so completely lacking money himself. In another letter he remarked that he was forced to study not so much political economy as his own private economy. From his modest and occasional literary fees Marx allotted a considerable portion

to comrades in the revolutionary struggle—émigrés who found themselves in even more difficult conditions. As a result, when the manuscript was ready Marx had no money to pay for mailing it to the publisher. Engels came to the rescue.

Reporting the imminent publication of the book to his colleague of the Communist League, Weydemeyer, Marx wrote [February 1, 1859] "I hope to win a scientific victory for our party." These words are strikingly characteristic of Marx's attitude to his work. He looked upon his theoretical work as the fulfillment of a most important obligation to the working class and to its vanguard, the Communist Party.

When Marx's *Critique of Political Economy* came out, the bourgeoisie met it with a conspiracy of complete silence. No notices of the book appeared in the press, whereas usually the worthless scribble of any ordinary university lecturer was marked by a series of reviews, paragraphs, etc. The bourgeoisie reckoned on killing Marx's book by silence. Engels tried to break through this conspiracy by writing a review, which was printed in the German newspaper *Das Volk* \*.

After quoting extensively from Marx's preface, Engels wrote "As we pursue our materialist thesis further and apply it to the present, the perspective of a tremendous revolution, indeed the most tremendous revolution of all time, therefore immediately unfolds itself before us."<sup>17</sup>

These words admirably characterize the *Critique of Political Economy*. For although Marx here confines himself to a consideration of the commodity and money, nevertheless the analysis represents the beginning of his great economic work, which was dedicated to proving the inevitability of the socialist revolution of the proletariat, the necessity of the dictatorship of the working class.

The "most tremendous revolution of all time," which in this period was present only in the brilliant vision of Marx and

\* *The People*, published by political émigrés in London.—Tr

Engels, has become the most tremendous reality of our epoch. The proletarian revolution has triumphed in an enormous country. Marx's statement that capitalism constitutes "the closing chapter of the *prehistoric stage* of human society"<sup>18</sup> has been confirmed. The Soviet socialist order in our country, both in conditions of peaceful construction and in circumstances of the most painful trials in the war against Hitlerite Germany, has demonstrated to the whole world its inexhaustible springs of strength and power.

### 3 THE FIRST VOLUME OF *CAPITAL*

After the publication of the *Critique of Political Economy*, Marx continued his work on the third chapter, "On Capital," which was to form the contents of the next part of the *Critique*. During the period October 1859 to January 1860 he resumed his studies in the British Museum, reread Engels' *Condition of the Working Class in England* and also the principal writings of Smith and Ricardo, and carefully studied the *Reports of the Inspector of Factories* for 1855-1859. The struggle to expose the Bonapartist agent Vogt, trips to Manchester and the Continent caused a six month's interruption in this work.

In August 1861 Marx again took up his writing. He began the manuscript with the analysis of the conversion of money into capital. Working with exceptional intensity and reducing his hours of sleep to a minimum, in a relatively short space of time (from mid-1861 to mid-1863) Marx, in his extremely small handwriting, filled 23 notebooks with material amounting to nearly 200 printer's sheets. Engels describes the contents of this manuscript as follows:

"It treats on pages 1-220 [notebooks I-V], and again pages 1159-1472 [notebooks XIX-XXIII], of the subject analyzed in Volume I of *Capital*, beginning with the transformation of money into capital and continuing to the end of the volume, and is the first draft for this subject. Pages 973-1158 [notebooks

XVI-XVIII] deal with capital and profit, rate of profit, merchant's capital and money capital, that is to say, with subjects which have been further developed in the manuscript for Volume III. The questions belonging to Volume II and many of those which are part of Volume III are not arranged by themselves in this manuscript. They are merely treated in passing, especially in the section which makes up the main body of the manuscript, *viz* pages 220-972 [notebooks VI-XV], entitled 'Theories of Surplus Value'. This section contains an exhaustive critical history of the main point of political economy, the theory of surplus value, and develops at the same time, in polemic remarks against the position of the predecessors of Marx, most of the points which he later on discussed individually and in their logical connection in Volume II and III."<sup>19</sup>

In the first notebooks of this series, which in their contents correspond to the first volume of *Capital*, there are many passages that were directly taken over by Marx for *Capital*. In the fifth notebook Marx begins a detailed examination of the technique of capitalist production, which he continues in notebooks XIX and XX. Having studied the history of technique, Marx executed his task with characteristic thoroughness. He reread his notebooks on technology, took a practical course for workers under Professor Willis at the Geological Institute, and studied related disciplines.

Marx attached enormous significance to the revolutionary influence of technique. He followed technical development with unfaltering attention. Liebknecht recalls that at his first meeting with Marx in the middle of 1850 the latter ridiculed the victorious forces of reaction in Europe, which imagined that the revolution had been strangled and did not suspect that the development of natural science and technique was preparing a new revolution.

At that time Marx was already prophesying to Liebknecht that steam would be succeeded by the electric spark and advising him to take a look at the first model of a train powered by

electricity, which was being exhibited then in London. And in the decline of his life, at the end of 1882, Marx took a lively interest in the discovery of Deprez, who was demonstrating for the first time in Munich the transmission of electrical energy over long distances.

With the sixth notebook there begins the historical outline of economic views which Marx entitled "Theories of Surplus Value"<sup>20</sup>. Begun as a critical-historical supplement to the third chapter, on capital (on the analogy of the similar excursions to Chapters I and II of the *Critique*), this outline grew into an exhaustive study, written in an exceedingly short space of time (April to August 1862).

Finally, the last three notebooks\* are devoted mainly to questions of capital accumulation, average rate of profit, etc.

In the manuscript of 1861-1863, especially in the first and last notebooks comprising it, Marx analyzed questions to which he had also devoted the monographs of 1857-1859. It is characteristic of Marx that in his preparatory writings in several instances he gives a consistently worked out, as it were concentrated, exposition of the most important parts of his doctrine: capital, surplus value, primitive accumulation, capital accumulation, etc.

It was Marx's custom to reread his notebooks and manuscripts many years after they had been written. He achieved the highest degree of perfection in his research and a most thoroughgoing theoretical elaboration by means of his favorite method of making frequent revisions. He made his most extensive revisions by using his former variants as raw material, on the basis of which he would start writing the exposition all over again in each case.

While in the process of working on the manuscript of 1861-

\* Notebooks XVI-XVIII. The last notebooks of the series (XIX-XXIII) are grouped by Engels with the first five as dealing with what became the contents of *Capital*, Vol. I—*Tr*



1863 Marx came to the conclusion that for purposes of publication the whole project would have to be considerably reorganized. The structural plan of *Capital*, formed at about this time, required a serious reworking of the material and its arrangement in a different order from that obtaining in the series of notebooks of 1861-1863.

The increased size of the task, on the one hand, and the delay in time, on the other, posed for Marx the question of publishing the whole work not as a continuation of the *Critique of Political Economy*, but in the form of an independent study.

In a short biography of Marx, Engels writes

"... hardly had the first part been published, when Marx discovered that he had not yet fully clarified all the details of the development of the basic ideas of the parts that were to follow, the manuscript, which is preserved to this day, is the best proof of this. Then he immediately began his work afresh, and hence, instead of this sequel, *Capital* appeared only in 1867."<sup>21</sup>

As early as the eighteenth notebook, which belongs to the end of 1862, Marx had sketched a rather detailed structural plan of the first volume of his work, devoted to the process of production of capital.

"First section *Process of production of capital* to be divided in the following way: 1. Introduction. Commodity, money. 2. Conversion of money into capital. 3. *Absolute surplus value* (a) Process of labor and process of increase of value, (b) Constant and variable capital, (c) Absolute surplus value, (d) Struggle for the normal working day, (e) *Simultaneous working days* (quantity of workers employed simultaneously). Sum of surplus values and rate of surplus value (magnitude and degree). 4. *Relative surplus value* (a) Simple co-operation, (b) Division of labor, (c) Machinery, etc. 5. Combination of absolute and relative surplus value. Correlation (proportion) between wage labor and surplus value. Formal and real subjugation of labor to capital. Productive and unproductive labor.

6 Conversion of surplus value back into capital Primitive accumulation Colonial theory of Wakefield 7 *Result of the process of production* The change in the appearance of the law of appropriation can be given under 6 or 7 8 Theories of surplus value 9 Theories of productive labor”<sup>22</sup>

In a letter to Kugelman of December 28, 1862, Marx says that his book will be called “Capital” while having as its subtitle “A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy” In January 1863 he planned to start preparing the manuscript for the printer, but the need for a more detailed investigation of the question of machinery caused a new delay

In the middle of June 1863 Marx started to rework his material to correspond with the structural plan which he formed at about that time

“Between 1863 and 1867, Marx had not only completed the first draft of the last two volumes of *Capital* and made the first volume ready for the printer, but had also mastered the enormous work connected with the foundation and expansion of the International Workingmen’s Association”<sup>\*23</sup>

Marx was the guiding spirit of the International, which was organized in 1864 “Marx was the heart and soul of this organization, he was the author of its first Address and of a host of resolutions, declarations, and manifestoes”<sup>24</sup>

According to Engels’ testimony, this enormous work affected Marx’s health, in consequence of which it became, in the final analysis, impossible for him personally to finish the preparation of the last volumes of *Capital*

In the beginning of 1865 a young man made the acquaintance of the author of *Capital*, the twenty-four-year-old medical

\* The Working Men’s International Association (the First International) was established in London on September 28, 1864 Its aim, as stated in the “Provisional Rules,” was “the protection, advancement and complete emancipation of the working classes” (See *Founding of the First International*, New York, 1937, also Letter 160, in *Marx-Engels, Selected Correspondence*)—Tr

student, Paul Lafargue (later one of Marx's most devoted disciples and a member of his family he married Marx's daughter Laura) Lafargue spent long hours in the company of the author of *Capital*, in his room and during strolls together Marx used to tell his young friend in detail about the contents of whichever part of *Capital* he was working on at the time Later Lafargue in his reminiscences *recreated the living picture of the surroundings* in which Marx worked and depicted the *style of work* characteristic of the creator of *Capital*

Lafargue describes the historic workroom of Marx in his lodgings in Maitland Park Road, where Marx lived for many years This room was situated on the first floor, a broad window overlooking the park flooded the room with light Bookshelves stood along the wall opposite the window and on both sides of the fireplace On the shelves were piled books, bundles of newspapers, and manuscripts Besides this there were two tables loaded with papers, books, and newspapers

At first glance it might seem that books and papers **were** thrown about in complete disorder, however, everything was actually in its place, and Marx could easily at any moment pull out from a seemingly chaotic pile the exact book or notebook that he needed He declined all attempts to "put in order" his books and materials These materials and books "were as obedient to his will as were his own limbs," says Lafargue

For Marx, books were intellectual tools, and not furniture He made numerous marks in books, which made it easy for him to find the passage he wanted Marx's books were arranged not according to their shapes, but according to their contents "They are my slaves and must serve my will," he used to say

In the middle of Marx's room there was a small, plain writing table, before which stood a wooden armchair Behind the armchair there was a leather-covered sofa, on which Marx would lie down and rest when he could work no longer At such times he would usually open some literary work or other and reread Goethe, Shakespeare, Aeschylus, and other favorite writers On

the mantelpiece there were photographs of Engels, Wilhelm Wolff (to whose memory Marx dedicated the first volume of *Capital*), his wife, and his daughters. Also on the mantel were cigars, tobacco, matches. Marx was a heavy smoker. He said jokingly to Lafargue that *Capital* would not bring him even the cost of the cigars he smoked while working on it.

Marx possessed an amazing capacity for work. He was passionately devoted to his work and would become utterly absorbed in it. Liebknecht tells how even during walks Marx would have a notebook with him in which he would make entries every so often. In his youth it often happened that he worked all night through. But even in his maturity he was usually at it long past midnight. Having gone to bed at two or three in the morning, he would be on his feet again between eight and nine, drink black coffee, read the newspapers, and go off to his room to work.

Lafargue tells us that while at his work Marx would often forget about eating and would have to be called several times to dinner. For recreation he would walk up and down the room. On the carpet that covered half the room there was a sharply defined trail from window to door, like a footpath in a meadow. Generally, walking was Marx's favorite form of recreation. On holidays he liked to go for long strolls in the neighborhood.

Such was the atmosphere of work in which *Capital* was created.

In two and a half years (from the middle of 1863 to the end of 1865) Marx wrote the rough draft of all three volumes of *Capital*. He wrote an enormous new manuscript, in the course of which he creatively reworked all the material that he had already accumulated. While he made extensive use of the preparatory studies (especially the manuscript of 1861-1863), Marx put much that was new into the rough draft of *Capital*. He continually turned afresh to the sources of concrete historical data and to related spheres of science.

Thus, for example, in working up the section on land rent in December 1865 he studied agricultural chemistry, read Liebig and Schoenbein. Marx worked with extreme care, checking several times every fact he introduced.

Wilhelm Liebknecht tells us that Marx drew up for himself a carefully worked out historical table in order to write on this basis a footnote of secondary importance. Lafargue testifies that Marx would often run to the British Museum to verify some fact that could not be established by his own books. In order to write twenty-odd pages in the first volume of *Capital* on English factory legislation Marx studied thoroughly a whole pile of "blue books"—official reports of all types.

Marx studied with the greatest care the "blue books," or official reports of parliamentary investigative commissions, factory inspectors and sanitary investigations. In these reports the "works and days" of the capitalist system stand forth in all their unadorned ugliness. The "blue books" were distributed among members of Parliament and numerous civil servants. But the "men of affairs" were not very much interested in dry records. Some of them used the fat tomes as shooting targets. From second-hand book dealers, the "blue books"—in which were collected stunning indictments of the greed and hard-heartedness of private property—came to Marx's workroom in Maitland Park Road. Here dry facts about the inhuman exploitation of the masses, whose whole life was converted into a simple means for expanding the value of capital, were transformed into lines that breathe indignation and wrath, sarcasm toward the oppressors, and warm partisanship in behalf of the oppressed.

The work was frequently interrupted by attacks of illness and by anxieties called forth by material need, at times Marx had to work exclusively at night.

At the beginning of May 1865 Marx proposed to finish *Capital* by September 1. At the end of July he reported to Engels:

"There are still three chapters to write in order to complete

the theoretical part (the first three books) Then there is still the fourth book, the historical-literary one, to write, which is relatively the easiest part to me as all the problems have been solved in the first three books and this last is therefore more of a repetition in historical form But I cannot bring myself to send off anything until I have the whole before me Whatever shortcomings they may have, the merit of my writings is that they are an artistic whole, and that can only be attained by my method of never having them printed until they lie before me as a *whole* This is impossible with the Jacob Grimm method, which is in general more suited to works not dialectically constructed ”<sup>25</sup>

At the end of 1865 Marx finished the rough manuscript of all three volumes of *Capital* On January 1, 1865, he began to prepare the fair copy and final draft for the first volume In a letter to Engels of February 13, 1866 Marx described the state of affairs thus

“As to this ‘damned’ book, the position is as follows it was *ready* at the end of December

“Although finished, the manuscript, gigantic in its present form, could not be prepared for publication by anyone but myself, not even by you

“I began the copying out and the *polishing of the style* punctually on the first of January, and the thing proceeded very merrily, as I naturally enjoyed licking the infant clean after so many birthpangs ”<sup>26</sup>

Marx was working thirteen hours a day However, the work was interrupted by illness and want, also by the most pressing affairs of the International The final version was produced with Marx’s characteristic carefulness and actually was still another complete reworking of the whole material In particular, Marx considerably lengthened (in comparison with the original plan) the section on the working day

The fair copy was prepared by the true companion of Marx’s life, his wife, Marx’s own handwriting was so indecipherable

that there could be no question of printing from his manuscript. Only in the middle of September 1866 were the first sheets of the manuscript sent off to Meissner in Hamburg, and in April 1867 Marx personally brought him the remaining part.

On October 13, 1866, Marx wrote to Kugelman:

"My circumstances (physical and external interruptions without intermission) make it necessary for the first volume to appear separately, not both volumes together, as I had at first intended. There will probably be three volumes after all.

"The whole work is divided as follows:

*Book I The Production Process of Capital.*

*Book II Circulation Process of Capital.*

*Book III Form of the Process as a Whole*

*Book IV Contribution to the History of Economic Theory*

"The first volume contains the first two books.

"The third book will, I think, fill the second volume and the fourth book the third.

"I considered it necessary to begin in the first book *ab ovo* [from the egg, *i.e.*, from the beginning—*Tr*], that is, to make in one chapter on commodities and money a *résumé* of my book which Duncker published. I thought that necessary not only for the sake of completeness, but also because even people with quite good heads did not grasp the matter quite rightly. <sup>27</sup>

Thus as late as October 1866 Marx thought he would manage to include in the first volume of his work the two first books, comprising both the production process of capital and the circulation process of capital. However the dimensions of the first book, devoted to the production process of capital, grew so large that it soon became evident to Marx that it would be necessary to limit the contents of the first volume to this book.

On April 17, 1867, Marx wrote from Hannover, where he was visiting his friend Kugelman, to his old fellow fighter in the Communist League, Becker, in Geneva:

"Last Wednesday I left London by steamer and on Friday

afternoon in storm and foul weather reached Hamburg, where I turned over to Mr Meissner the manuscript of the first volume. It went to press at the beginning of this week, so the first volume will appear at the end of May. This, without doubt, is the most terrific shell that has ever been fired at the head of the bourgeoisie (including landed proprietors) "

That was how Marx appraised the significance of the first volume of *Capital*.

The first volume of *Capital* came out, not at the end of May as Marx had expected, but considerably later, since the publisher and printer were in no great hurry. Marx fussed about the delay in setting the type and prodded the publisher in every way. But Marx himself took a long time correcting the proofs, on which he made rather substantial revisions of the text. He sent the proof sheets to Engels, who read them through and gave advice as to what to revise. Marx usually took this advice.

As he sent off the last sheet to the printer on the night of August 16, 1867, at 2 00 A M, Marx wrote to Engels:

"So *this volume is finished*. This has been possible thanks to *you* alone. Without your self-sacrifice for me I could never possibly have done the enormous work for the three volumes. I embrace you, full of thanks!"<sup>28</sup>

Marx dedicated the first volume of *Capital* to his "unforgettable friend, the bold, true, noble champion of the proletariat, Wilhelm Wolff," who died in 1864, just in the period of Marx's most intensive work on *Capital*. The first volume of *Capital* was published in the beginning of September 1867 in a printing of one thousand copies—the same quantity in which the *Critique of Political Economy* had been issued.

As in the case of the *Critique*, Marx was extremely agitated by the question of the reception that would greet *Capital*. "The silence about my book makes me fidgety," he wrote to Engels on November 2, 1867, "our kind, who lives only once, can die of impatience" for results.

He waited impatiently for polemic and strife to arise around



the book, for people to start talking about it. He was not motivated by pride of authorship, even less by conceit, which was absolutely foreign to Marx's nature. What he did want was that the working class, its most active and advanced elements, might learn about the book.

On this occasion Marx's fears turned out to be without foundation. The atmosphere had changed radically as compared with the 1850's. If then the bourgeoisie could afford to hush up Marx's work, now this could not be done, the First International was in existence, and in several countries there were detachments of the working class who marched behind Marx, the bourgeoisie had to accept battle.

After the book was out, excerpts from the preface to *Capital* appeared in some journals and newspapers. On the advice of Marx and other friends, Engels undertook a whole campaign to publicize the appearance of the first volume of *Capital*. He wrote several reviews calculated for placement even in hostile organs. This, as Marx and Engels said, was a military stratagem, the reviews had to be written in such a way that bourgeois editors might print them without suspecting that they dealt with a book that constituted the sharpest theoretical weapon of the proletarian revolutionary struggle. These reviews have now been printed (in the first part of Volume XIII, of the Collected Works of Marx and Engels [in Russian]) and are convincing testimony to the skill with which Engels mastered his difficult task.

Engels' first review appeared as early as October 30, 1867, in *Zukunft*, a Berlin journal of democratic tendency. In the next two or three months Engels managed to place several notes.

In March 1868 there appeared in the *Volksstaat*, edited by Wilhelm Liebknecht in Leipzig, two articles by Engels, written with the special purpose of acquainting German workers with the contents of *Capital*. Somewhat later the same publication carried a review by Joseph Dietzgen. In the Lassalleian *Sozial-Demokrat* was printed a series of articles by Schweitzer, with a

detailed account of Marx's book. A review written by Engels for the radical English journal *Fortnightly Review* was rejected as "too dry," in spite of the friendly efforts of the radically minded Professor Beesly, who was close to the editors.

A curious lack of understanding was shown by the well known poet, Ferdinand Freiligrath, who on receiving the book wrote to Marx: "I know that in that Rhineland many merchants and factory owners are very enthusiastic about *Capital*. In these circles it will accomplish its purpose, and will in addition be an indispensable source of reference for scholars."<sup>29</sup>

To be sure, as it turned out, there was some truth in Freiligrath's last statement. While they "annihilated" Marx, the leaders of bourgeois science began quite unceremoniously filching from him concrete historical material, sources, etc.

But among the proletariat Marx's ideas were rapidly disseminated, and he was fully justified in writing in the postscript to the second edition: "The understanding that *Capital* quickly found in wide circles of the German working class is the best reward for my work."<sup>30</sup>

The reaction of the bourgeoisie to *Capital* was of quite a different order. From the circles of organized bourgeois science Eugen Duehring was the first to respond. Delighted that in Marx's book Roscher and other generally acknowledged "luminaries" of German science got strong treatment, Duehring came out with a review that showed, as Marx noted in a letter to Engels, that he understood absolutely nothing in *Capital*. Another review, which appeared in the *Zentralblatt*, served as the occasion for the well known letter of Marx to Kugelmann of July 11, 1868, where he gave a remarkable explanation of the theory of value.

"The learned and unlearned spokesmen of the German bourgeoisie tried at first to kill *Das Kapital* by silence, as they had managed to do with my earlier writings,"<sup>31</sup> wrote Marx in the postscript to the second edition.

But the historical circumstances had changed profoundly

The activity of the International, the Paris Commune,\* the upsurge of the growing labor movement forced the bourgeoisie to adopt a different tactic. In the place of the conspiracy of silence came the "mealy-mouthed babblers of German vulgar economy"

#### 4 AFTER THE PUBLICATION OF THE FIRST VOLUME

After the publication of the first volume, Marx's further work on *Capital* took two directions: on the one hand, he continued to occupy himself with the first volume in connection with translations and new editions, and on the other, he worked on the continuation of his book.

In September 1868 at the Brussels Congress of the First International the German delegates introduced a resolution on the significance of *Capital* for the international labor movement and recommended that it be translated into other languages. Marx expected most from an English translation of *Capital*, but this did not materialize for a long time, the English edition did not appear until after Marx's death.

The first translation of *Capital* into a foreign language was the Russian translation. The appearance of Marx's immortal book produced a tremendous impression on advanced Russians of that period. Only a few weeks after *Capital* was published in Hamburg, copies of the German edition arrived in St. Petersburg and Moscow, where Marx's work found most attentive readers among the progressive Russian intelligentsia. Among the first people in Russia to become acquainted with Marx's

\* After the capitulation of the French bourgeois government to the Germans in the Franco-Prussian War of 1870-71, the citizens of Paris, organized in the National Guard, resisted attempts by the government to disarm them, and for seventy-two days, from March 18 to May 28, 1871, held the city in the name of the Commune. This body was elected by the citizens of Paris, a majority of whom were workers, and constituted the first attempt in history to establish a dictatorship of the proletariat. See Karl Marx, *Civil War in France*—Tr

brilliant work was the great Russian scientist K. A. Timiriazev. In his article, "Ch. Darwin and K. Marx," he describes the circumstances under which he first heard about *Capital*, as follows:

"In the autumn of 1867, on a journey from Simbirsk, where I conducted experiments following the plan of D. I. Mendeleev, I dropped in to see P. A. Ilenkov in the recently opened Petrovsky Academy. I found P. A. Ilenkov in his study, at his desk, before him lay a thick, new-looking German volume, with a paper knife still stuck into it—this was the first volume of *Capital* by Marx. Since it came out at the end of 1867, this obviously was one of the first copies to reach Russian hands. With enthusiasm and characteristic skill, Pavel Antonovich gave me on the spot practically a whole lecture on the volume, which he had already succeeded in reading, he knew of Marx's previous activities, since he spent the year 1848 abroad, primarily in Paris, and he was personally acquainted with the activities of the pioneers of Russian capitalism, the sugar refiners, and could illustrate these activities by examples with which he was personally acquainted. Thus, a few weeks after the appearance of *Capital*, a professor of chemistry in the recently opened Petrovsky Academy was already one of the first disseminators of Marx's ideas in Russia."<sup>32</sup>

Also among the first to become acquainted with *Capital* soon after its publication was N. F. Danielson (Nikolai —on), one of the most prominent representatives of the Populist movement,\* who, however, in spite of his work on the Russian

\* The Populist, or Narodnik, movement arose in the 1870's among the Russian intelligentsia. The Populists asserted that capitalism would not develop in Russia, that socialism could be developed directly from the peasant commune. Hence they looked upon the peasantry rather than the working class as the agent of social progress. In the 1880's and 1890's the Russian Marxists (first Plekhanov, then Lenin) fought this theory, Lenin completing its destruction in two of his early works: *What the "Friends of the People" Are* (1894) and *The Development of Capitalism in Russia* (1899) —Tr

translation of *Capital* and his long years of correspondence with Marx and Engels, remained to the end of his life a romantic economist and a sentimental critic of capitalism, clinging to reactionary positions as to the "impossibility" of capitalist development in Russia

According to the testimony of contemporaries, Marx's book made such a deep impression on N F Danielson that he decided right off to get busy organizing a translation of *Capital* into Russian. The task was, of course, far from an easy one. Nevertheless, certain publishers, whom N F Danielson approached with the proposal, were ready to agree on publishing the work, but only on condition that a sufficiently experienced and competent translator be found. The choice fell on M A Bakunin. Evidently Bakunin's hostility to Marx appeared as no special hindrance in the eyes of a person like N Danielson, it was enough that Bakunin knew the German language and contemporary European affairs. When he got the offer from the publisher Liubavin, Bakunin, who was very hard up at the time, accepted. However, Bakunin's translation got no further than the first pages of the first chapter. The translation of these pages turned out to be so bad that it could not even be used in later work. After this Bakunin renounced all further efforts.

Before the Bakunin venture proved unsuccessful, Nikolai —on had managed to persuade another publisher to put out *Capital* in Russian, N P Poliakov, who, according to the testimony of the well-known Russian economist Flerovsky, lived "in the circle of those whom Chernyshevsky left behind and who shared his views." Thinking, evidently, that in this way the publication of a Russian translation of *Capital* had been put on firm ground, on September 18, 1868, Nikolai —on addressed a letter to Marx, in which he wrote

"The significance of your book *Capital A Critique of Political Economy* has prompted one of the publishers (N P Poliakov) here to undertake the publication of this work in Russian. Various external circumstances make desirable the simultaneous

appearance of the first and second volumes. Therefore, as representative of the publisher, I most humbly beg of you, if you think it possible, to send me the sheets of the second volume separately, as they come from the press."

Marx replied very quickly to Nikolai —on's letter, expressing his complete readiness to render the translator the necessary assistance. However, with regard to the second volume, Marx told him that he should not wait for its appearance, since it might be held up for six months. In addition, Marx pointed out that the first volume was in itself a finished whole.

News of the imminent appearance of a Russian translation roused a lively interest in Marx. In a letter to Engels of October 4, 1868, he wrote: "I am naturally extraordinarily pleased to hear that my book is appearing in a *Russian* translation in St. Petersburg." Engels was of the same opinion, and wrote in reply to Marx on October 8: "The Russian translation is very pleasing, as soon as it progresses somewhat further, one must inform the press."

After Bakunin had given up the translation of *Capital*, the question arose of finding another translator. This time the choice fell on H. A. Lopatin—a Russian revolutionary and adherent of the "People's Will," [a populist party—*Ed*] who aided Marx in the struggle against Bakunin and was a member of the General Council of the First International. Early in 1870 Lopatin came to live in London, where he soon made Marx's acquaintance, and between the two, close, friendly relations were established. Marx greatly valued Lopatin and had a high opinion of him. In a letter to Engels (July 5, 1870), he told him about his new Russian friend, writing: "A very wide-awake, *critical* mind, cheerful character, as stoical as a Russian peasant, who puts up with anything he finds."

Two years later, in a letter to Nikolai —on of May 28, 1872, Marx wrote of Lopatin: "There are few people whom I love and respect as I do him." In his turn Lopatin held Marx in high

esteem and remained devoted to his memory until the end of his life

Expectations that the author of *Capital* would render Lopatin the necessary assistance in the work were fully justified. In several instances Marx helped the translator by his explanations, directives, and advice. In Lopatin's opinion the first chapter of *Capital* (the first part in the later edition), being the most difficult to master, needed radical revision. Marx concurred in this opinion and expressed willingness to carry out this task, and in consequence of this Lopatin began the translation with the second chapter (the second part in the later edition). However, Marx's practical work in the First International took up all his time, and he was unable to work on the revision of the first chapter before the Russian translation appeared.

On the other hand, Lopatin's attitude to the project he had undertaken was one of exceptional conscientiousness. He called Marx's attention to a number of passages that required alterations of one kind or another, and in many instances Marx introduced the needed additions. He made such an addition, for example, to footnote 32 in the third part<sup>33</sup> in connection with Senior's confusion of concepts. This addition was made for the first time precisely in the Russian edition. Sometimes Lopatin would himself make some additions to the text and would receive Marx's assent. In later editions of the German original these addenda were introduced by Marx himself. In many instances, wanting to obtain a more complete idea of some author or other cited by Marx, Lopatin went to the British Museum Library and there acquainted himself with this author's works in the original.

However, Lopatin did not succeed in completing the whole task. When he had translated approximately one third of the first volume of *Capital*, he had to abandon further work on the translation, since he had undertaken a cause which in his opinion brooked no delays. He set out for Siberia, attracted by the idea of liberating Chernyshevsky, who was in exile under

strictest surveillance After this the question of a translator came up for a third time Not finding a suitable person, Nikolai —on decided to finish the work himself In connection with this he entered into a lively correspondence with Marx The author of *Capital* gave him the necessary assistance, sending him corrections for the text by mail Nikolai —on, having learned from Lopatin of Marx's intention to revise the first chapter of *Capital*, wrote to Marx in May 1871

"Will you not be so kind—if you have not altered your intention—as to send me this chapter and also the changes you desire in other passages of your book (for example, relative to N Senior), in view of the fact that the translation is near its completion Since in all probability you have not yet revised the first chapter, I should be much obliged to you, if you would set an approximate date for sending it"<sup>34</sup>

In answer to this request Marx informed the translator that work on the first chapter was being held up by a two months illness and by an accumulation of business that could not be postponed In consequence of this Nikolai —on decided not to hold up the printing of the already finished translation, but to add the revised first chapter to the end of the book He informed Marx of his intention in a letter in which he expressed confidence that "the reader will naturally lose nothing by having two versions of the first chapter"<sup>35</sup>

In March 1872 the first Russian edition of *Capital* came out On receiving a copy of this edition Marx wrote to Nikolai —on on May 28, 1872 "First of all, many thanks for the beautifully bound copy—the translation is *masterly* I would be glad if I could get another copy, unbound, for the British Museum" In this letter Marx expressed regret over the fact that he had not been able to start revising his book for the second edition until the very end of 1871, as a result of which this work could not be taken into account in issuing the Russian edition

The tsarist censorship gave permission for the publication



of the Russian translation of *Capital* with the following interesting justification

"Although in his convictions the author is undoubtedly a socialist and the whole book reveals a definitely socialist character, yet, noting that its treatment cannot be called accessible to everyone and that, on the other hand, its form is that of a scientific-mathematical argumentation, the committee recognizes that for this book prosecution in the courts is impossible "

The censor's permission is explained by the fact that the book was written in an insufficiently accessible form and by the fact that in this period the labor movement in Russia was still weak and tsarism felt no serious threat from the working class

That was how matters stood in 1872. Later on, when the labor movement had become a serious factor in the revolutionary struggle, the tsarist government began brutal prosecution of *Capital*, for studying or harboring this book revolutionaries were sent into penal servitude

The Russian edition came out in three thousand copies. A month and a half later Danielson informed Marx that the edition was one third gone

By the fall of 1871 the first German edition was sold out, and beginning with December, Marx began the preparation of a second edition. Early in 1872 Marx found, through Longuet, a translator for the French edition of *Capital*, Joseph Roy, and contracted with the publisher Lachâtre

The second German edition was printed in separate parts in 1872-1873 and in mid-1873 came out in one volume. The French edition also came out in separate parts during the years 1872-1875. Thus the work on the second and the French editions proceeded to some extent simultaneously

Several additional notes were written for the second edition. Marx remarked that he had also made numerous partial alterations, to a considerable degree of a stylistic nature, which were scattered throughout the book

Marx put even more labor into preparing the French edition.

And the French edition differs more from the German original than does the second German edition from the first. In letters of that period Marx frequently mentions the tremendous labor the preparation of the French edition cost him. Thus, in a letter to Sorge of June 21, 1872, Marx writes as follows:

"As for my *Capital*, the first German part of it will appear next week, at the same time the first French part will appear in Paris. You will receive from me directly, both for your own personal use and for some of your friends, several copies of these parts—both the German and the French—as they come out. The French edition (on the title page of which it says, and *definitely* not for literary effect—*entièrement révisée par l'auteur* [entirely revised by the author—*Tr*] for this was a hellish labor for me) "

If Marx spoke of the "hellish labor" the French edition cost him after the appearance of the first part, the experience of his further work on this edition only confirmed his opinion. In a letter of February 12, 1873, Marx wrote to Friedrich Bolte: "The correction of the French translation gives me more work than if I had done the whole translation myself. Therefore, unless I find a fully competent English translator, I shall have to take this on myself, and in the meanwhile the French edition has already prevented me from putting the final touches on the second volume and will continue to do so until it is altogether finished."

Marx speaks of the colossal work he had to put in on the French edition. This work was of two kinds. On the one hand he carefully corrected the translation, in the postscript to the French edition Marx points out that in many instances he changed the "exact and even literal" translation with which the translator presented him, in order to make the book "more comprehensible to the reader." On the other hand, Marx exhaustively revised the text for the French edition. On this aspect of the work he wrote in the postscript:

"Having once undertaken this work of revision, I was led to

apply it also to the basis of the original text (the German edition), to simplify some arguments, to complete others, to give additional historical or statistical material, to add critical estimates, etc."<sup>36</sup>

A considerable part of these addenda could not get into the second German edition, because the latter had already come out while Marx was revising the text for the French version. He introduced a particularly large number of additions into the last division of the first volume, devoted to capital accumulation. Hence in the postscript to the French edition Marx wrote that "it possesses a scientific value independent of the original and should be consulted even by readers familiar with the German language."

Even after the publication of the French edition Marx frequently mentioned it in his letters in one connection or another, most often in connection with the question of translating *Capital* into foreign languages. In all these references stress is laid, on the one hand, on the independent scientific significance of the French version, primarily with respect to the broad supplementary material and the textual revision worked out by Marx for this edition. Marx points out that consequently no translator of *Capital* can get along without the French edition. On the other hand, he emphasizes that for the translator the German text is indispensable as the authentic original. In 1876 Marx corresponded with Sorge about an English translation of *Capital*, which it was proposed to delegate to the translator Douai. In the letter of September 27, 1877, Marx writes to Sorge:

"The French edition took up so much of my time that I shall *never* again personally participate in any translation whatever. You must find out whether Douai knows *English* well enough to be capable of accomplishing this task *alone*. If he does, I grant him full permission and my blessing. And in this case in making the translation he ought to use, along with the second German edition, also the *French edition*, into which I in-

roduced some new material and in which much of the presentation is far better ”

In his next letter, dated October 19, 1877, Marx writes to Sorge

“Along with this letter I am sending you a manuscript for Douai, in case he translates *Capital*. Indicated in the manuscript are, besides some changes in the German text, the passages where the text of the *French edition* should be substituted for the German edition. In the copy of the French edition, which is intended for Douai and was also sent to your address today, the above-mentioned passages are marked. As it turned out, this job took a lot more of my time than I had supposed, and on top of that there was added foul influenza, which I have not yet altogether shaken off.

“If the edition materializes, Douai should indicate in the preface that, along with the second German edition, he also used the French edition, published later and revised by me, but he must not suggest in any way that the *American* edition is *authorized* ”

The projected English edition did not materialize at that time. This task was only accomplished ten years later, after Marx's death. In editing the English edition Engels had before him the instructions for the English translation mentioned in this letter, which Sorge had sent back to him,<sup>37</sup> these instructions were used by Engels both in putting out the English translation in 1886 and in putting out the later German editions.

As is known, the first Russian translation of *Capital* came out as early as 1872. When the Russian translator of *Capital*, N. Danielson, asked Marx about a second edition of the Russian translation, Marx wrote in reply (November 15, 1878)

“With regard to a second edition of *Capital*, permit me to make the following suggestions

“1 I should like the *division into chapters*—and the same applies to chapter *subdivisions*—to follow the French edition.

“2 The translator continually and carefully to check the sec-

ond German edition against the French edition, since the latter contains a lot of important alterations and additions (although, it is true, I was forced more than once, especially in the first chapter, to simplify the presentation in translating it into French)

"3 I find it useful to make some changes and shall try to get them ready by no later than a week hence, so as to be able to send them to you next Saturday (today is Friday with us) "

In his next letter Marx actually informed Danielson of two changes that should be inserted in the text

We find several interesting comments on the French edition in the correspondence of Marx and Engels Engels received the separate parts of the French translation as they came out On November 29, 1873, he wrote to Marx, evidently in connection with the receipt of the current part

"Yesterday I read in the French translation the chapter on factory legislation With all respect to the art with which this chapter was transformed into elegant French, I am sorry for the beautiful chapter Force and sap and life have gone to the devil The ability of a professional writer to express himself with a certain elegance has been bought at the expense of castrating the language To indicate one's thoughts in this modern artificial French will be more and more impossible The very rearrangement of sentences, required nearly everywhere by pedantic formal logic, has taken all the punch and vitality out of the presentation To base the English translation on the French model would in my opinion be a great mistake In English there will be no need to weaken the forceful expression of the original, what is inevitably lost in particularly dialectical passages will be compensated by the greater force and brevity of the English in many other passages "

In his reply to this letter Marx made the following comment [November 30, 1873]

"Now that you've started on the French translation of *Capit-*

*tal*, I'd be glad if you would go on with it I believe you will find spots that are better than the German "

To which Engels replied [December 5, 1873]

"On the French translation, more next time So far I find that where you have *reworked* it, it is indeed better than the German "

Marx's work on the first volume of *Capital* did not end with the publication of the French edition On the contrary, he planned to subject his book to a further serious revision for the next edition Engels tells about this in the preface to the third edition, which he put out already after Marx's death In this preface Engels wrote

"Marx proposed at first to revise the greater part of the text of the first volume, to give a clearer formulation to some theoretical postulates, to add new ones, to supplement the historical and statistical material with new data bringing it up to date Illness and the necessity of attending to the final editing of the second volume forced him to abandon this "<sup>38</sup>

The realization of this big project was prevented by Marx's illness and the need to work on the next volumes, and he confined himself to noting a series of passages in the French edition that should be taken over for the next German edition As early as the end of 1877 Meissner, the publisher, proposed to Marx that he prepare a third edition, but he did not manage to get down to this task until a year later At the end of 1882 and the beginning of 1883 Marx devoted his energies to preparing the third edition, but death soon interrupted his work

However, Marx left considerable prepared material for this new German edition This material was used by Engels in putting out the third, and later also the fourth edition In his own personal copies of the French and second German editions Marx had made a considerable number of comments and emendations, and also notations indicating the passages for which the text of the French edition was to be taken as the basis Guided by these directives and comments of Marx, Engels

prepared first the third, and then the fourth edition. In the fourth edition these directives of Marx were more fully realized than in the third. It was provided with several editorial notes by Engels, a more careful checking was given to the huge quantity of source references, and so forth.

In his preface to the third edition, in telling of the work he did in preparing this edition, Engels says that he did not change a single word unless he was sure that Marx would have done exactly the same himself. Engels begins his preface to the fourth edition by indicating that the task of this edition was to establish a definitive edition of both text and notes.

After the publication of the first volume of *Capital* Marx set to work again on its continuation. He proposed to include both of the last books in one volume, which was to be dedicated to the faithful companion of his life, his wife. In the course of the last decade and a half of his life Marx frequently returned to the manuscript of 1863-1865, composing new variants of individual parts, broadening his knowledge of the literature, studying a host of books on questions dealt with in the succeeding volumes of *Capital*.

In the beginning of 1868 Marx read several books on rural economy, such as Morton's *Cyclopaedia of Agriculture*, Thuenen's *The Isolated State*, and Fraas's *Nature of Rural Economy*. Further, he made the acquaintance of, and became tremendously interested in, Maurer's work, *Introduction to the History of the Internal Structure of the Mark, Farm, Village, and Town*. In the second half of 1868 he studied the land relations and tenant right of Ireland and at the end of the same year he began the study of communal landownership in Russia.

Having begun to study the Russian language late in 1869, in the 1870's Marx paid great attention to the economics of Russia, especially of its post-reform\* development.

\* The development following the abolition of serfdom in Russia in 1861.—Tr

"He had studied for years the originals of the statistical reports and other publications on real estate, which had become inevitable after the 'reform' of 1861 in Russia. He had made extracts from these originals, which had been placed at his disposal to the fullest extent by his Russian friends, and he had intended to use these notes for a new elaboration of this part. Owing to the variety of forms represented by the real estate and the exploitation of the agricultural producers of Russia, this country was to play the same role in the part on ground rent that England did in Volume I in the case of industrial wage labor" <sup>39</sup>

Besides official sources and statistical materials, he followed all the latest publications of Russian economic and partly also historical literature and journalism. He read such works as Flerovsky's *Condition of the Working Class in Russia*, Patlaevsky's *Money Market in Russia from 1700-1761*, Kostomarov's *Historical Monographs*, Beliaev's *Peasants in Rus*, Vasilchikov's *Ownership and Cultivation of Land in Russia and Other European States*, and others.

Throughout his life Marx studied with great interest Russia's history, political life, social movement, and ideological development. He devoted special attention to the study of Russia during the final decade and a half of his life, after he had begun to study the Russian language and to read Russian authors in the original.

During this period Marx frequently requested his Russian friends and acquaintances to send him certain books, symposiums, and journals published in Russia. Many services of this sort were rendered him by the Russian translator of *Capital*, Nikolai —on. In one of his first letters to Nikolai —on, Marx thanked him for sending Russian books. He reports that all the books have been duly received by him and adds: "I shall be very glad to have the rest of the economic works by the same



author [Chernyshevsky—*AL*] (I have the *Notes on John Stuart Mill*) ”

Hermann Lopatin, who at this time saw much of Marx, tells us that Chernyshevsky's work on Mill was one of the first books in Russian Marx read. In the Marx archives are preserved the notebooks in which this work by Chernyshevsky is summarized. In the postscript to the second edition of the first volume of *Capital*, Marx characterizes Chernyshevsky as a “great Russian scholar” who in his work on Mill masterfully elucidated the bankruptcy of bourgeois political economy. In his memoirs Lopatin speaks of the profound respect felt by Marx for Chernyshevsky.

“He told me more than once that of all modern economists Chernyshevsky was the only really original thinker, whereas the rest were no more than simple compilers, that his works were full of originality, force, and depth of thought and that they represent the only modern productions in this science really worth reading and studying.”<sup>40</sup>

Marx displayed a tremendous interest in the works of the great Russian revolutionary democrat and enlightener, and he took a lively interest in his fate. On December 12, 1872 he wrote to Nikolai —on “I should like to publish something on the life, personality, etc., of Chernyshevsky, so as to arouse sympathy for him in the West.” In the next letter to Nikolai —on, on January 18, 1873, he says “As for Chernyshevsky, it is up to you to decide should I speak only of his scientific merits or may I touch on the other aspect of his activity? In the second volume of my work he will, of course, figure only as an economist. A considerable portion of his writing is known to me.” This letter was written in the period when Marx still thought that *Capital* would consist of two volumes. Thus he intended to give Chernyshevsky due attention in the last volume of his work, primarily, it would seem, in those sections devoted to the development of capitalism in agriculture and to the theory of rent. However the third volume of *Capital* was edited by Engels.

principally from those manuscripts of *Capital* that date from the mid-1860's This explains the circumstance that Marx did not succeed in carrying out his original plan, according to which he proposed to devote considerable attention to the economic views of Chernyshevsky

The enormous importance attributed by Marx to Russian scientific thought is attested by the fact that he did not consider it possible to publish the second volume of *Capital* without a careful study of the materials and data collected in the Russian literature

In a letter to Kugelmann of June 27, 1870 Marx wrote.

"As to Meissner's pressure for the second volume, I have not only been interrupted by illness throughout the winter, I also found it necessary to learn Russian, because in dealing with the land question it became essential to go to the original sources in studying the relations of Russian landed property"<sup>41</sup>

As early as the beginning of 1871 Marx had mastered the Russian language to such an extent that he was able to read Russian literature rather freely His study of Russian and the goal he set himself in undertaking this task are also described in a letter to Siegfried Meyer of January 21, 1871, in which he writes

"I do not know whether I told you that since the beginning of 1870 I have had to occupy myself with the Russian language, which I now read rather freely This was prompted by my receiving from St Petersburg Flerovsky's work, which is of very considerable interest, on the 'Condition of the Working Class (especially the peasants) in Russia' and by my wanting also to acquaint myself with the economic (excellent) works of Chernyshevsky (whose reward was to be exiled to penal servitude in Siberia for seven years) The result is worth the efforts a man of my years must expend in mastering a language so markedly different from the classical, Germanic, and Romance languages The ideological movement just now arising in Russia bears witness to the fermentation that is taking place deep underneath "

Marx was enormously interested in Flerovsky's work, *The Condition of the Working Class in Russia*. He remarked that the author drew a vivid picture of the actual condition of the Russian workers, chiefly the agricultural workers and the peasant seasonal workers, who were mercilessly exploited by the landowners, capitalists, and merchants. As early as February 10, 1870, Marx wrote to Engels: "I have read the first 150 pages of Flerovsky's book. This is the first work to tell the truth about Russian economic conditions." And further on Marx gives an exceedingly sharp evaluation of this book and its author.

"The method of presentation is quite original, at times it reminds one most of Montei. One can see that the man has traveled around everywhere and seen everything for himself. A glowing hatred of landlords, capitalists, and officials. No socialist doctrine, no mysticism about the land (although in favor of the communal form of ownership), no nihilistic extravagance.

In any case this is the most important book which has appeared since your *Condition of the Working Class*."<sup>42</sup>

Marx was well informed on other outstanding representatives of Russian economic thought also. In one of the letters to Nikolai — on he asks him to send *D. Ricardo's Theory of Value and of Capital* by Sieber, who was at that time professor at Kiev University. In another letter he mentions receiving a review of the first volume of *Capital* that appeared in the journal *Vestnik Evropy*, which, as is known, was written by I. I. Kaufman. This review was extensively quoted by Marx in the postscript to the second edition of the first volume of *Capital*, Marx himself translating the quoted parts into German. Further, Marx studied with great interest and attention the works of the outstanding Russian statistician N. A. Kablukov and of V. Vorontsov, one of the foremost economists and publicists of the Populist movement. He became acquainted with the research on land relations in Russia done by the well known propagator of liberal-Populist reforms, Prince A. I. Vasilchikov, and read the special studies on agricultural agronomy and chemistry by A. N. Engelhardt and

the latter's sketches of peasant life and economics, entitled *From the Village 12 Letters*, which at that time enjoyed a wide popularity in Populist circles. Among the many books read by Marx during these years of intensive work on Russian scientific literature and journalism we come upon the works of the Slavophiles\* Samarin and Koshelev, the representative of the liberal nobility and fervent champion of "peasant reform" Golovachev, the publicist of bourgeois liberal persuasion V. Skaldin, and others. It may be asserted without exaggeration that in acquainting himself with the social relations of Russia from primary sources, Marx grasped all the important tendencies of Russian social thought, as represented in the current scientific literature and journalism.

In a letter to P. Lavrov, February 18, 1875, Marx regretfully remarks: "I was sent a whole package of books and official publications from St. Petersburg, but it was stolen, probably by the Russian government. In it were, among other things, the reports of the 'Commission on Rural Economy and Rural Productivity in Russia' and 'On the Tax Question,' materials that are absolutely necessary for the chapter of the second volume in which I speak of landed property, etc. in Russia."

Altogether characteristic is the fact that among the books sent to Marx by his Russian friends, along with folios of official statistical data, various departmental publications, and highly specialized scientific studies, we find also works by the great Russian satirist Saltykov-Shchedrin. In February 1873 Marx read the famous work by Shchedrin, *Gentlemen from Tashkent*, which had been sent to him by Danielson.

Marx studied the works of Russian scholars and publicists with special care; they attracted the attention of the author of *Capital* by their copious and significant factual material, and he

\* A nineteenth-century group of Russian writers and publicists, mostly of the landed nobility, who favored traditional Slavic institutions, as opposed to the "Westerners," who advocated cultural and political reform along Western European lines.—*Tr*

often returned to them several years later. Thus, for example, Marx first became acquainted with *The Peasant Cause in the Reign of Alexander II*, by the Russian publicist Skrevitsky, in February 1873, and read it again ten years later, at the beginning of 1883. Marx was especially interested in the works of Russian historians. After reading the *Historical Monographs* of Kostomarov, Marx made detailed excerpts from his sketch of Stepan Razin. Naturally it was not accidental that among the works of this outstanding historian, whose merit lay in his study and description of just those periods in Russian history when mass popular movements were in the foreground, Marx's attention was particularly attracted by a study devoted to the great peasant war of the sixteenth century. Marx's interest in the question of the historical origin of the Russian village commune, and in the disputes centering on this problem, is well known.<sup>43</sup> Marx studied in detail the book by the Slavophil historian Beliaev, *Peasants in Rus*, which proved the great historical antiquity of the agrarian commune in Russia and investigated, on the basis of rich archive data and primary sources, the communal life of the Slavs. Marx's attention was attracted by the polemic between Beliaev and the historian Chicherin, one of the creators of the so-called "state theory" of the Russian historical process.

In one of his letters to Danielson Marx asks to be brought up to date on this controversy and he soon received from his correspondent a lengthy survey of the literature on the question of the origin of the agrarian commune and the history of land relations in Russia. Marx studied with special attention works that shed light on this problem. He made extensive excerpts from Kaufman's article, "The Russian Peasant Commune," which appeared in the journal *Nachalo*, he studied the work of the well-known Russian historian Sergeevich, *Veche\** and

\* Old Slavic term for "assembly", refers usually to the popular assembly in towns—*Tr*

*Prince*, read the book by the historian and philologist Sokolovsky, describing the history of the agrarian commune in North Russia, etc Marx also made excerpts from the work on communal landownership written by M M Kovalevsky, the eminent Russian sociologist and historian, whose investigation Marx and Engels considered to be a big step forward in the study of pre-class society Marx devoted so much labor and time to the study of Russian economic and statistical literature that, according to Paul Lafargue, Engels once jokingly remarked to Marx "It would give me pleasure to burn up the Russian publications on the condition of agriculture, which for several years now have kept you from finishing *Capital* "

Marx also continued his study of the agrarian question in Ireland, India, Australia, and America During this period he studied a wide range of economic literature, primarily of a concrete character, especially concerning the history of trade, credit, and banks Along with these subjects Marx took a lively interest in various branches of science, from the history of primitive society to mathematics and astronomy

Describing this period in the life of the author of *Capital*, Engels wrote

" Marx was now able to turn again to his scientific pursuits, the sphere of which was by that time greatly extended For this man who in studying any subject studied its historical origin and its preconditions, every individual question naturally gave rise to a whole series of new questions He studied primitive history, agronomy, Russian and American agrarian relations, geology, etc , chiefly in order to work out the section on land rent in the third volume of *Capital* more fully than anyone had thought of doing before him In addition to all the Germanic and Romance languages which Marx read freely, he also studied Old Slavonic, Russian, and Serbian "44

During the 1870's Marx frequently started to write the final text of *Capital*, but illness increasingly interrupted his work Eight variants of the beginning of the second volume have been

preserved. The last one to bear a date, the seventh, is marked 1878.

"About this time Marx seems to have realized that he would never be able to complete the second and third volume in a manner satisfactory to himself, unless a complete revolution in his health took place"<sup>45</sup>

The last manuscript, the eighth, served as the basis for the third division of the second volume.

Besides continuing his work on *Capital*, Marx devoted much attention to the popularization of his fundamental work, followed bourgeois and petty bourgeois criticism, and kept an eye on new tendencies in the development of capitalism.

He looked through and corrected two brochures—by Johann Most and Domela Nieuwenhuis—on *Capital* (both brochures were entitled *Capital and Labor*). In 1875 he exposed Duehring, who had come forward with a pretentious critique of Marxist socialism, for the *Anti-Duehring*. Marx wrote the chapter "From the *Critical History*." In 1879 he carefully investigated the criticism of *Capital* in the university text by Adolf Wagner, *The Universal or Theoretical Doctrine of National Economy*. The summary of this work is sprinkled with Marx's comments, which are of quite exceptional interest.

At the end of the 1870's Marx listened with great interest to Lafargue's account of the activities of monopolistic combines, and in 1881 he made a careful and detailed summary of two magazine articles describing the activities of the first big monopolies in America: Vanderbilt in the sphere of railway transportation and Rockefeller's Standard Oil. Marx's work on *Capital* stopped only with his death.

## 5 ENGELS' WORK ON *CAPITAL*

After Marx's death Engels was confronted by a twofold task with regard to *Capital*: the publication of the later editions of the first volume, on the one hand, and, on the other, the execu-

tion of the tremendous job of publishing the last two volumes, which Marx had left in rough drafts

By the end of 1883 Engels had put out the third edition of the first volume. In this edition he included several passages from the French edition, as indicated by Marx, and transferred to it the stylistic emendations made by Marx in his own personal copy. Three years later—in 1886<sup>46</sup>—Engels put out an English edition. The translation was made from the third German edition by an old friend of Marx and Engels, Samuel Moore, and a member of Marx's family, Dr. Aveling. Marx's youngest daughter, Eleanor Marx Aveling, checked for this edition the numerous quotations from English sources, which Marx had translated into German.

In 1890 Engels issued the fourth edition of the first volume, which was to "establish as nearly as possible the definitive form of the text and notes." For this purpose Engels looked once more through Marx's notations and introduced additional material from the French edition, besides this, he inserted "some additional explanatory notes, especially where changed historical conditions appeared to demand this."<sup>47</sup>

The other part of his task, the publication of the last volumes of *Capital*, turned out to be considerably harder. Here Engels had to carry out a colossal assignment, which no one else would have been capable of executing. In his article on Engels, Lenin wrote

"by the publication of Volume II and III of *Capital*, Engels erected in memory of the genius that had been his friend, a majestic monument on which he without intending it indelibly carved his own name. These two volumes of *Capital* are, indeed, the work of both Marx and Engels."<sup>48</sup>

Engels begins his preface to the second volume of *Capital* as follows

"It was no easy task to prepare the second volume of *Capital* for the printer in such a way that it should make a connected



and complete work and represent exclusively the ideas of its author, not of its publisher "49

Engels found at his disposal numerous manuscripts, consisting for the most part of fragments, many of them represented the different variants that had subsequently been revised. For both volumes it was first of all necessary to sort out the manuscripts, written in Marx's quite illegible hand, which the writer himself sometimes could not decipher. Further, for each part the main variant had to be selected and supplemented by material taken from other, unused variants.

As the result of tremendous toil on Engels' part, the disjointed rough drafts were transformed into the two volumes of *Capital*. In this work Engels confined his editorial intervention to the narrowest limits, making no changes that would destroy the identity of the Marxian text.

"I have been content," he writes in the preface to the second volume, "to interpret these manuscripts as literally as possible, changing the style only in places where Marx would have changed it himself and interpolating explanatory sentences or connecting statements only where this was indispensable, and where the meaning was so clear that there could be no doubt of the correctness of my interpretation "50

The second volume was issued by Engels in 1885. Official German science greeted this remarkable book with the same conspiracy of silence as had greeted many other of Marx's works. In this connection Engels wrote in a letter to N. Danielson:

"I have no doubt that Volume II will bring you the same satisfaction as it has brought me. In it are developed theories of such a high order that the average reader will not take the trouble to penetrate their depths or follow them to the end. This is what is actually happening in Germany, where the whole of historical science, including political economy, has fallen so low that it would hardly be possible to go lower."

And further on he gives an exhaustive and at the same time

murderous description of the condition of official German "science" at that time

"Our professorial socialists have as regards theory never risen above the level of vulgar economists with philanthropic leanings, and at the present time they have sunk to the level of simple apologists of Bismarck's state socialism. For them Volume II will always remain a book sealed with seven seals. It is surely a beautiful example of what Hegel called the irony of world history that, with the rise of Germany to the position of the mightiest European power, German historical science has been brought down to the same pitiful level that it reached in the period of the deepest political decline of Germany, after the Thirty Years' War.\* But such is the actual situation. And now German 'science,' in a quandary, goggles at this new book, unable to understand it, and only a healthy fear of the consequences prevents the representatives of this 'science' from criticizing it publicly, and so the official economic literature maintains an attitude of cautious silence toward it. However, Volume III will force them to speak up."

This prediction was fully vindicated: actually, the last volume of Marx's work untied the tongues of the apologists of the bourgeoisie, they were forced to speak up.

Engels expected to publish the third volume of *Capital* soon after the appearance of the second volume. However, the preparation of the former presented more difficulty than Engels had originally supposed. For instance, he had to begin by dictating the whole text, so as to get a copy for editing purposes.

\* The Thirty Years' War (1618-1648) arose from a struggle between the Habsburg emperor and rebellious German princes, especially those in the Protestant North of Germany, for the control of Germany. Eventually Denmark, Sweden, and France were directly involved in the hostilities, England and Holland indirectly. The mercenaries of the various powers looted and burned German towns and villages, and the country was in ruins by the end of the war. By the Peace of Westphalia the princes won added sovereign rights, and Germany was cut up into nearly three hundred virtually independent small states.—Tr

"This also was punishing work," he informs Becker, and adds immediately,—“but then, it's a remarkable piece of work ”

These difficulties, added to Engels' illness and the fact that he was overburdened with the practical political work of guiding the international labor movement, held up the publication of the last volume of *Capital* for many years, and it appeared only at the end of 1894—half a year before Engels' death. Here the editorial interpolations were more numerous than in the second volume. The majority of them deal with an appraisal of the evolution of capitalism from the time Marx wrote the manuscript up to the period of its publication.

With the appearance of the first volume of *Capital* the German bourgeoisie and its mouthpieces had attempted to kill Marx's work by a “conspiracy of silence ”

However, historical circumstances had changed radically. The activities of the International, the Paris Commune, the upsurge of the growing labor movement—all this led to a sharpening of class contradictions. The mealy-mouthed babblers of German vulgar economy in those days (who, among others, fathered many of the reactionary ideas that went to make up the cannibal “ideology” of Hitlerism) entered the lists against *Capital*.

There began an unexampled campaign of lies, slander, and distortion, which flared up with special vigor after Marx's death, when the pygmies of reactionary “science” in various countries no longer felt the restraining fear of his merciless sharp pen. In the forefront appeared the nonsensical charge that the theory of surplus value was borrowed by Marx from Rodbertus, a charge “circulated at first on the sly, and only by some individuals, but now, after his death, proclaimed as an indisputable fact by German professorial and state socialists and their adherents”<sup>51</sup>. The Italian professor Achille Loria made the ludicrous claim that the discovery of the materialist conception of history belonged to him. This adventurer, who in old age found refuge for himself in the cattle pen of fascist “science” in Mussolini's Italy, got

the answer he deserved from Engels in the preface to the third volume of *Capital*<sup>52</sup> The lying charge of a distortion allegedly committed in a quotation from a speech by the English Chancellor of the Exchequer Gladstone was noisily promoted (according to the little known S Taylor) by Lujo Brentano in the official organ of the German industrialists—Brentano being at that time the rising star of German university science The absurdity of this charge was thoroughly exposed in Engels' preface to the fourth edition of the first volume of *Capital*<sup>53</sup> and also in his brochure *Brentano contra Marx*, published in Russian in the *Marx-Engels Archives*, Vol II (VII)

Attempts to criticize the essential content of *Capital* for a long time centered around the so-called "contradiction" between the first and third volumes, which was invented by bourgeois opponents of Marxism Even before the appearance of the third volume these people evinced great interest in the question of how Marx would resolve the difficulty involved in the fact that under capitalism commodities sell at prices that deviate considerably from their labor-created value, because of differences in the organic composition of capital The exhaustive solution of this problem given by Marx in the third volume of *Capital*, in the theory of price of production, was of course "unsatisfactory" to them The chorus of criticism ranged all up and down the scale, beginning with the nauseating cries of A Loria about the "mystification" to which, in his opinion, Marx resorted, and ending with the "modest interpretation" of Werner Sombart, who announced that labor-created value is "not a historical, but a logical fact," yet was willing to reconcile himself to it as a "logically useful fiction" When Sombart became obliged by his reputation to engage in self-advertising flirtation with Marxism and barefaced "borrowing" from *Capital*, his unpardonable distortion of Marx went to such lengths that he earned the following commendation from his teacher, Gustav Schmoller "What Sombart left of Marx resembles a shapeless torso, a body that lacks both arms and legs and in addition has had its heart torn

out" A worthy climax to the career of the chameleon Sombart is his servile groveling before the Hitlerite cannibals

The "argumentation" of the bourgeois opponents of *Capital* seemed to have been drained to the last drop in Boehm-Bawerk's book, *The Theory of Marx and Its Critique* (1896) <sup>54</sup> Nevertheless, for bourgeois science the refutation of Marx has become a touchstone by which inexperienced fledgelings and respectable masters alike continually test their strength "The progress of Marxism and the fact that its ideas are spreading and taking firm hold among the working class inevitably tend to increase the frequency and intensity of these bourgeois attacks on Marxism, which only becomes stronger, more hardened, and more tenacious every time it is 'annihilated' by official science" <sup>55</sup>

The campaign of bourgeois science against *Capital*, begun from the position of economic liberalism, continues under the aegis of imperialist "theories," and is conducted at the present time with particular frenzy by the "theoreticians" of fascism, whose pogrom yells and hysterical raving have lost all resemblance to logical argumentation

Engels' work on *Capital* did not end with the publication of the third volume In his prefaces to the last two volumes Engels rebuts the bourgeois criticism of *Capital* in the preface to the second volume, the charge that Marx plagiarized from Rodbertus, in the preface to the third volume, those who speculated on the imaginary "contradiction" between the first and third volumes of *Capital* When he had released the third volume of *Capital*, Engels attentively followed the reception that greeted this book in the press The wave of criticism that appeared in the bourgeois literature prompted Engels to take up his pen once more While suffering excruciatingly from the illness that was soon to bring him to the grave, in the last weeks of his life Engels wrote the brilliant economic essay entitled "Supplement to *Capital*, Volume III" <sup>56</sup> It is mentioned in some of Engels' letters In a letter to Kautsky of May 21, 1895, he says:

"For the *Neue Zeit*\* I am going to give you, among other things, an essay Supplement and Postscript to Volume III of *Capital* 1 Law of Value and Rate of Profit, an answer to the doubts of Sombart and Conrad Schmidt Then will follow 2. a very significant change in the role of the stock exchange since 1865, when Marx wrote about it Depending on the need and time, a sequel will follow "

Of the two parts Engels succeeded in writing only the first As to the second part, it has been preserved only as a short draft summary, which Engels wrote for his own use The first part appeared in the *Neue Zeit* soon after Engels' death, but the draft summary on the "change in the role of the stock exchange" saw the light only in 1932<sup>57</sup>

Engels' article on the law of value and the rate of profit, besides being an important supplement to the third volume of *Capital*, is of great value for the understanding of the economic theory of Marxism as a whole Countless critics of Marx had consumed mountains of paper in proving the notorious "contradiction" between the first and third volumes of *Capital* In his article Engels gives the decisive retort and thoroughly exposes both this type of open enemy of Marxism, and the opponents who, arrayed in the garments of "friends," would reduce value to a "logical fact" (W Sombart) or a "theoretically necessary fiction" (C Schmidt) Engels shows the historical emergence of value in deep antiquity, on the threshold of civilization, in the period of the rise of exchange He further shows the historical transition from value to prices of production at the time of the displacement of simple commodity production by capitalism In this way Engels explains and interprets Marx's thesis that value is not only theoretically but also historically *prior* (prior) to prices of production Engels' sketch is a beautiful model of the genuinely materialist explanation of Marx's theory of value and serves to this day

\* *New Time*—theoretical organ of German Social-Democracy, edited by Karl Kautsky from 1883 to 1917—*Tr*

as an unsurpassed weapon in the struggle against all kinds of idealistic distortions of Marxism

The special significance of this sketch lies in the fact that it gives a sharp and clear appraisal of the nature of simple commodity production and the process of transition from this stage to capitalism. Engels presents the law of value as the law of movement of commodity production. He stresses the exceedingly long duration of the epoch during which the law of value is operative, and traces in a series of actual historical examples the rise of capitalist relations, showing how these relations take hold of the sphere of production.

The second part of Engels' last economic work remained unwritten—only an expanded plan of it is preserved. Here Engels set himself the task of describing the changes and shifts that occurred in capitalist economy during the last third of the nineteenth century.

This period marked the transition from the old capitalism of the epoch of free competition to imperialism—the epoch of the domination of monopolies, when all the contradictions of the bourgeois order are tremendously sharpened. The task of Marxist investigation of imperialism as a higher phase of capitalism was carried out by Lenin, who continued the work of Marx and Engels and raised Marxism to a new and higher level. Relying on the basic postulates of *Capital*, basing himself on the fundamental laws of capitalist development, which had been investigated by Marx, Lenin created the theory of imperialism as the new and final stage of capitalism. Lenin and Stalin have made a profound and all-sided investigation of the imperialist stage of capitalism, they have provided a complete characterization of all the special features of imperialism—parasitic, decaying, dying capitalism.

Engels did not provide a characterization of the new historical stage in the development of capitalism. In the draft of the article on the stock exchange are noted only some of the new phenomena in the economics of capitalist countries, but

the question of a new stage in the development of capitalism is not posed. Engels remarks on the spread of the limited-liability form of enterprise, the transformation of individual enterprises into limited-liability companies, the launching, concentration, and unification of the enterprises in whole branches of industry, and, finally, the emergence of monopolies. As an example of a large-scale monopoly he mentions the English alkali (chemical) trust, with the enormous (in terms of those days) capital of six million pounds sterling. The question of monopolies and their role in economic life attracted Engels' attention during the last years of his life. His editorial interpolation in the twenty-seventh chapter of the third volume of *Capital*<sup>58</sup> is specifically concerned with this question.

Only Engels' death on August 5, 1895, put a stop to his work on the economic theory of Marxism.

What does the story of Marx's work on *Capital* teach us?

It shows, in the first place, that Marx was victorious in his unequal struggle against the ruling classes only because of his iron, unshakable will, the will of a proletarian revolutionary, who chose his path to a predetermined goal and marched along it to the end.

The second conclusion is that Marx sustained this victory because he was a person capable of gigantic labor, a person of colossal labor discipline. In the most distressing conditions, while overcoming enormous difficulties, he knew how to work stubbornly and systematically, day after day, proceeding steadily to the achievement of his goal.

The third conclusion, which is of special relevance to the whole broad sphere of scientific, propagandist, and theoretical work, is this: Marx's work, like the work of Engels, Lenin, and Stalin, presents us with a model of extraordinary conscientiousness and scientific scrupulousness. For all engaged in the sphere of Marxist-Leninist theory, in the sphere of propaganda, in the sphere of science, Marx's work on *Capital* serves as a model of labor culture, of self-criticism, of high demands on oneself.



## Reference Notes

*Translator's note* Wherever possible, references are made to English editions of the works cited by Leontiev. Since several of these works are available in English in more than one edition, their titles are given for the reader's convenience. Additional sources, not cited by Leontiev, and other comments by the translator are so identified. All references to the English version of Volume I of Capital are to the International Publishers' edition.

### CHAPTER I

- 1 *History of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (Bolsheviks)*, New York, 1939, p. 9 (hereafter referred to as *History of the CPSU* )
- 2 Frederick Engels, *Socialism Utopian and Scientific* in *Karl Marx Selected Works*, New York, n.d., Vol. I, pp. 164-65 (hereafter referred to as *KMSW*) —Tr
- 3 V. I. Lenin, "On the Theory of Marxism," *Marx-Engels-Marxism*, New York, 1935, pp. 63-64 (hereafter referred to as *M-E-M*)
- 4 *Idem*, "Karl Marx," *Selected Works*, New York, n.d., Vol. XI, p. 19 (hereafter referred to as *SW*)
- 5 *Idem*, "The Three Sources and Three Component Parts of Marxism," *SW*, Vol. XI, p. 5
- 6 *Idem*, "What the 'Friends of the People' Are and How They Fight the Social Democrats," *SW*, Vol. XI, p. 605
- 7 *Engels on "Capital,"* New York, 1937, p. 3
- 8 V. I. Lenin, "What the 'Friends of the People' Are" *SW*, Vol. XI, p. 463
- 9 *Idem*, *Filosofskie tetradi (Philosophical Notebooks)*, Moscow, 1938, p. 241
- 10 Marx to Engels, January 14, 1858, *Karl Marx and Frederick Engels Correspondence 1846-1895—A Selection*, New York, 1936, p. 102 (hereafter referred to as *Marx-Engels Sel. Corresp* )

- 11 Karl Marx, *Capital*, Vol I, New York, 1939, p xxx—*Tr.*
- 12 Joseph Stalin, "Dialectical and Historical Materialism," *Leninism Selected Writings*, New York, 1942, p 406
- 13 *Capital*, Vol I, pp xxx-xxx1
- 14 V I Lenin, "On Dialectics," *SW*, Vol XI, p 83—*Tr*
- 15 *Idem*, "Karl Marx," *SW*, Vol XI, p 22
- 16 *Idem*, "What the 'Friends of the People' Are " *SW*, Vol XI, p 421
- 17 *Idem*, "The Three Sources and Three Component Parts of Marxism," *SW*, Vol XI, p 3
- 18 Joseph Stalin, Report to the Seventeenth Party Congress, *Leninism Selected Writings*, p 359
- 19 Karl Marx, *A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy*, Chicago, 1904, p 70 (hereafter referred to as *Critique of Political Economy*)—*Tr*
- 20 Frederick Engels, *Herr Eugen Duehring's Revolution in Science (Anti-Duehring)*, New York, 1939, p 168
- 21 Karl Marx, *Critique of Political Economy*, p 300
- 22 *Ibid*, pp 69-70—*Tr*
- 23 V I Lenin, "Memorial to Marx and Engels," *Collected Works* (hereafter referred to as *CW*), Vol XXIII, p 291, New York, 1945
- 24 *Capital*, Vol I, p xxiii
- 25 V I Lenin, *CW*, Vol XXVII, p 333, Russian ed
- 26 *Idem*, "Frederick Engels," *M-E-M*, p 39
- 27 Joseph Stalin, Interview with the First American Labor Delegation in Russia, *Leninism*, New York, n d, Vol I, pp 359-60
- 28 V I Lenin, "What the 'Friends of the People' Are " *SW*, Vol XI, p 423
- 29 See V I Lenin, *SW*, Vol VII, Pt I: "The Doctrine of the State and of the Dictatorship of the Proletariat," *passim*, for example, p 33 ("The State and Revolution")  
 "A Marxist is one who *extends* the acceptance of the class struggle to the acceptance of the *dictatorship of the prole-*

- ariat* This is the touchstone on which the *real* understanding and acceptance of Marxism should be tested"—*Tr*
- 30 V I Lenin, "Karl Marx," *SW*, Vol XI, p 35
- 31 Marx to Ruge, September 1843 (published in the *Deutsch-Franzoesische Jahrbuecher*, Paris, 1844), *Marx/Engels Gesamtausgabe* (Frankfurt A M, 1927) Abt I, Bd 1, Halbbd 1, p 575 The translation given here is taken from V I Lenin, *M-E-M*, p 61 ("What the 'Friends of the People' Are "), where the English is closest to the German original—*Tr*
- 32 V I Lenin, "The Three Sources and Three Component Parts of Marxism," *SW*, Vol XI, p 3—*Tr*
- 33 *Idem*, *Materialism and Empirio-Criticism*, *SW*, Vol XI, p 370
- 34 *History of the CPSU*, pp 109-10 [See also Stalin, work cited above (n 12) p 410—*Tr*]
- 35 V I Lenin, *Materialism and Empirio-Criticism*, *SW*, Vol XI, p 392 [Emphasis corrected to follow original Russian—*Tr*]
- 36 See, for example, Lenin's speech on the "Food Tax," *SW*, Vol IX, esp pp 186-87—*Tr*
- 37 *History of the CPSU*, p 110 [See also Stalin's work cited above (n 12), p 411—*Tr*]
- 38 V I Lenin, *CW*, Vol II, p 335, Russian ed
- 39 *Idem*, *Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism* in *CW*, Vol XIX, p 159, New York, 1942
- 40 *History of the CPSU*, p 358
- 41 Joseph Stalin, Interview with the First American Labor Delegation, *Leninism*, Vol I, p 360

## CHAPTER II

- 1 V I Lenin, "What the 'Friends of the People' Are " *SW*, Vol XI, pp 420-21
- 2 *Capital*, Vol I, p 311

- 3 Paul Lafargue, "Reminiscences of Marx" in *KMSW*, Vol I, p 90 —*Tr*
- 4 See *Capital*, Vol I, pp 87-88 and 111-16 —*Tr*
- 5 *Capital*, Vol I, p 61 —*Tr*
- 6 For Marx's definition of "vulgar" or "apologetic economy," in contradistinction to the classical school, see *Capital*, Vol I, pp 52-53, n 2, see also *ibid*, p 88, n 1 —*Tr*
- 7 The Russian ed (1935) of *Capital*, Vol I, used by Leontiev is based on the 4th German ed (1890) The "sections" of the Russian edition—except for the last—correspond to the "parts" of the English editions, but the chapter enumeration within the "sections" or "parts" differs Hence, where Leontiev refers to chapters, the corresponding chapter numbers of the English version are noted in square brackets —*Tr*
- 8 Ch XV, section 10, in the English ed —*Tr*
- 9 In the Russian ed "Section" VII includes "Parts" VII and VIII of the English version —*Tr*
- 10 *Capital*, Vol I, p 577 —*Tr*
- 11 *Ibid*, p 786 —*Tr*
- 12 This chapter is of particular interest to American readers In it Marx sketches the socio-economic scene in the northern states of the United States before the Civil War and subsequent rapid growth and concentration of capital In those early days "the wage-worker of today is tomorrow an independent peasant, or artisan, working for himself" (p 795) By the time Marx wrote this chapter, however, the US had "ceased to be the promised land for emigrant laborers Capitalistic production advances there with giant strides " (p 799) —*Tr*
- 13 V I Lenin, *Filosofskie tetrady*, p 241
- 14 *Ibid*, p 242
- 15 *Idem*, "What the 'Friends of the People' Are " *SW*, Vol XI, p 425
- 16 *Ibid*, p 423

- 17 For the above three passages quoted from Lenin, see *SW*, Vol XI, pp 5, 6, and 7
- 18 V I Lenin, "On Dialectics," *SW*, Vol XI, p 81 —*Tr*
- 19 *Capital*, Vol I, pp 147-48
- 20 V I Lenin, "The Three Sources and Three Component Parts of Marxism," *SW*, Vol XI, p 6
- 21 Frederick Engels, "Karl Marx," *KMSW*, Vol I, p 15
- 22 V I Lenin, "Karl Marx," *SW*, Vol XI, p 24
- 23 *Capital*, Vol I, p 216
- 24 *Ibid*, p 540
- 25 *Ibid*, p 250
- 26 See *ibid*, pp 597-98 (including n 1 to p 597) and p 638 —*Tr*.
- 27 V I Lenin, "Karl Marx," *SW*, Vol XI, p 28
- 28 See *Capital*, Vol III, Chicago, 1909 —*Tr*
- 29 *Capital*, Vol I, p 661 —*Tr*
- 30 Frederick Engels, *Socialism Utopian and Scientific*, *KMSW*, Vol I, p 176
- 31 See *KMSW*, Vol I, p 211 —*Tr*
- 32 Joseph Stalin, Report to the Sixteenth Party Congress, *Leninism*, Vol II, p 253
- 33 V I Lenin, "Differences in the European Labor Movement," *SW*, Vol XI, p 739
- 34 *Idem*, *CW*, Vol XXIV, p 159, Russian ed
- 35 *Capital*, Vol I, p 789
- 36 V I Lenin, "What the 'Friends of the People' Are " *SW*, Vol XI, p 605
- 37 Franz Mehring, *Iunosheskie gody Karla Marksa (Youthful Years of Karl Marx)* (1906), p 28 (in Russian)
- 38 *Capital*, Vol I, p xxv, n 1 Marx's "sarcastic comment" on the Russian review was omitted from the English ed —*Tr*.
- 39 *Ibid*, p 15
- 40 *Ibid.*, pp 19-20 [A more literal rendering of the German original of the last phrase is ". . . just as many a man

in a braided coat means more than a man out of one"—  
an allusion to the strutting German bureaucrat—*Tr* ]

- 41 *Ibid*, p 20
- 42 *Ibid*, p 56
- 43 *Ibid*, p 57
- 44 *Ibid*, p 155
- 45 *Ibid*, p 155
- 46 *Ibid*, p 241
- 47 *Ibid*, p 250
- 48 *Ibid*, p 240
- 49 *Ibid*, pp xvii-xviii
- 50 V I Lenin, *CW*, Vol II, pp 413-14, Russian ed
- 51 *Capital*, Vol I, p xix
- 52 *Ibid*, p 274
- 53 *Ibid*, pp 606-07
- 54 *Ibid*, p 606
- 55 *Ibid*, pp 608-09
- 56 *Ibid*, p 657
- 57 *Ibid*, p 662
- 58 *Ibid*, p 664
- 59 *Ibid*, p 365
- 60 *Ibid*, p 443
- 61 *Ibid*, pp 406-07
- 62 *Ibid*, p 786, n
- 63 *Ibid*, p xxv
- 64 *Ibid*, p 313, n 1
- 65 *Ibid*, p 137, n 2
- 66 *Ibid*, p 188, n 1
- 67 *Ibid*, p 188, n 1
- 68 *Ibid.*, p 200, n 1

### CHAPTER III

- 1 "Zur Kritik der Hegelschen Rechtsphilosophie," first published in the *Deutsche-Franzoesische Jahrbuecher*, Paris, 1844, where the article by Engels, mentioned in the next

- paragraph, also appeared See *Marx/Engels Gesamtausgabe*, Abt I, Bd 1, Halbbd I, pp 607-21—Tr
- 2 V I Lenin, "Frederick Engels," *M-E-M*, p 38
  - 3 Karl Marx and Frederick Engels, *The German Ideology* (Parts I and III), New York, 1939—Tr
  - 4 V I Lenin, "The Three Sources and Three Component Parts of Marxism," *SW*, Vol XI, p 5
  - 5 Marx to Engels, June 22, 1867, *Marx-Engels Sel. Corresp.*, p 221
  - 6 Marx to Lassalle, February 22, 1858, *ibid*, p 224
  - 7 *Ibid*, p 219
  - 8 Karl Marx, *Critique of Political Economy*, p 15 [During the crisis of 1857 Marx "scored a beat" for the *Tribune* over the *New York Times*. He reports his journalistic triumph to Engels in a letter of Dec 8, 1857 "With the *Tribune* I have experienced a satisfaction. On November 6 I wrote an article for them in which I explained the Bank Act of 1844, saying that the farce of suspension would follow in a couple of days, but that one should not make such a great fuss over this monetary panic. The real business would be the industrial crash, which was imminent. The *Tribune* printed this as a leader [N Y *Daily Tribune*, Nov 21, 1857—Tr]. The *New York Times* (which has entered into feudal relationship with the *London Times*) answered the *Tribune* three days later, said in the first place that the bank would *not* suspend, praised the Act in the manner of the money-article writers of Printing House Square and declared talk of an 'industrial crash' in England to be 'simply absurd'. This was printed on the 24th. The next day the *Times* received by Atlantic telegraph the news that the bank had *suspended*, and simultaneously, news of the industrial distress"—Tr]
  - 9 Marx to Engels, December 8, 1857, *Marx-Engels Sel. Corresp*, p 225

- 10 Karl Marx, *Critique of Political Economy*, p 9 [For the "Introduction" see *ibid.*, pp 265-312 —Tr]
- 11 *Ibid*, p 305
- 12 Both plans are presented in the form of an appendix to the edition of the *Critique* published by the Marx-Engels-Lenin Institute, 1933-1935
- 13 For the letters to Engels and Weydemeyer, see *Marx-Engels Sel. Corresp*, Nos 38 and 43, for the letter to Lassalle, see note 14 below —Tr
- 14 Marx to Lassalle, February 22, 1858, *Marx-Engels Sel Corresp*, p 224
- 15 KMSW, Vol I, p 356 [Where the English translation is somewhat improved from that in the Kerr (Chicago) ed of the *Critique* —Tr]
- 16 *Ibid*, p 357
- 17 *Ibid*, p 363
- 18 *Ibid*, p 357 —Tr
- 19 *Capital*, Vol II, Chicago, 1913, p 8
- 20 This outline, which Engels intended to publish as Vol IV of *Capital* (see his preface to Vol III, p 17), was issued only after his death by Karl Kautsky (*Theorien ueber den Mehrwert*, 4 vols, Stuttgart, 1905-1910), and has so far not appeared in an English translation —Tr.
- 21 Marx and Engels, *Collected Works*, Vol XVI, Pt II, p 258, Russian ed
- 22 *Arkhiv Marksa i Engelsa* (Marx-Engels Archives), Vol II (VII), p xii
- 23 *Capital*, Vol III, p 11 (Engels' preface)
- 24 V I Lenin, "Karl Marx," SW, Vol XI, p 12
- 25 Marx to Engels, July 31, 1865, *Marx-Engels Sel Corresp*, p 204
- 26 *Ibid*, pp 204-05
- 27 *Ibid*, pp 215-16
- 28 *Ibid.*, p 226



- 29 See Karl Marx, *Letters to Dr. Kugelmann*, New York, 1934, p 69, where Freiligrath's letter is printed, in a translation that differs slightly from Leontiev's version —*Tr.*
- 30 The four first paragraphs of Marx's postscript to the 2nd German ed of *Capital* (1873) were omitted from the English ed. The first three paragraphs deal with alterations made in the text of the 1867 ed, and the fourth opens with the sentence quoted here. The rest of the fourth paragraph reads as follows: "Herr Mayer, a Vienna manufacturer and a man economically of the bourgeois point of view, in a brochure published during the German-French war [*i.e.*, the Franco-Prussian War of 1870 —*Tr.*] strikingly demonstrated that the great theoretical sense which is counted as a German heritage has been altogether lost by the so-called educated classes of Germany, whereas in the working class of that country it is having a new revival" (Translated from the German of the Volksausgabe, 7th ed, 1923, ed by Karl Kautsky, pp XL-XLI) —*Tr.*
- 31 *Capital*, Vol I, p xxv
- 32 K. A. Timiriachev, *Nauka i demokratia* (*Science and Democracy*), 1920, p 466
- 33 *Capital*, Vol I, p 208, n 1, second paragraph —*Tr.*
- 34 *Letopis marksizma* (*Annals of Marxism*), II (XII), p 37
- 35 *Ibid*, p 42
- 36 *Capital*, Vol I, p 842 —*Tr.*
- 37 See Engels to Sorge, April 29, 1886, in *Science & Society*, Vol II, No 3 (Summer 1938), p 352 —*Tr.*
- 38 *Capital*, Vol I, p XXIV, Russian ed (1935)
- 39 *Capital*, Vol III, p 16 (Engels' preface)
- 40 *Hermann Aleksandrovich Lopatin (1845-1918)*, Moscow, 1922, p 71 (in Russian)
- 41 *Letters to Dr Kugelmann*, p 112
- 42 *Marx-Engels: Sel. Corresp.*, pp 283-84

- 43 See, for example, Nos 115 and 167 in *Marx-Engels. Sel Corresp.*, and the preface to the Russian ed (1882) of the *Communist Manifesto* in *KMSW*, Vol I, pp 191-92 For Engels' later views on this question, see his letters to Danielson (Nos 226 and 228 in *Marx-Engels Sel Corresp*) —*Tr*
- 44 Marx and Engels, *Collected Works*, Vol XVI, Pt II, p 260, Russian ed
- 45 *Capital*, Vol II, p 10 (Engels' preface)
- 46 Although Engels released it to the printer in November 1886, the actual date of publication of the English ed was January 1887 See *Capital*, Vol I, pp 843 ff (Appendix IV) —*Tr*
- 47 *Capital*, Vol I, p 825 (Engels' preface to the 4th ed)
- 48 V I Lenin, "Frederick Engels," *M-E-M*, p 40
- 49 *Capital*, Vol II, p 7
- 50 *Ibid*, pp 7-8
- 51 Engels' preface to *Capital*, Vol II, p 12 [where the translation differs from the Russian version quoted by Leontiev —*Tr*], see also Engels' preface to the first German ed of *The Poverty of Philosophy* [by Karl Marx, New York, n d —*Tr*]
- 52 The Russian text here refers to the *second* volume, apparently by an oversight See also *Engels on "Capital,"* p 98, n 2 —*Tr*
- 53 *Capital*, Vol I, Appendix II, pp 827-33, and n 10 on p 839 —*Tr*.
- 54 Published in English as *Karl Marx and the Close of His System* (1898) —*Tr*.
- 55 V I Lenin, "Marxism and Revisionism," *SW*, Vol XI, p 703
- 56 Published in *Engels on "Capital,"* pp 94-117 —*Tr*
- 57 See *ibid*, pp 115-17 —*Tr*
- 58 *Capital*, Vol III, pp 518-19, also included in *Engels on "Capital,"* pp 118-19, in a different translation —*Tr*.

## *Biographical Index*

- ARISTOTLE (384-322 B C ) Greek philosopher, tutor of Alexander the Great Founded the Lyceum at Athens Regarded as greatest authority throughout the Middle Ages Marx called him the "Alexander of Macedon of Greek philosophy"
- AESCHYLUS (525-456 B C ), Greek dramatist with whom Greek tragedy first assumed its classical form
- AVELING, Dr Edward (1851-1898), English physician, socialist, one of the founders of the Socialist League (1884) Together with Samuel Moore, translated into English the first volume of *Capital* Husband of Marx's youngest daughter, Eleanor
- BAKUNIN, Mikhail (1814-1876), one of the founders of the anarchist movement
- BASTIAT, Frédéric (1801-1850), French economist, advocate of free trade and "capitalism for all," opponent of socialism
- BECKER, Johann Philipp (1809-1886), German worker Fought in the German Revolution of 1848-49 Leader of the Geneva section of the First International
- BEESELY, Edward Spencer (1831-1915), English historian and positivist Professor of history at University College, London, 1859-93
- BELIAEV, Ivan (1810-1873), Slavophil historian of Russian law, professor at Moscow University
- BENTHAM, Jeremy (1748-1832), English jurist, philosopher and publicist
- BISMARCK, Prince Otto von (1815-1898), Prussian junker and leading minister of the German Empire (1862-90) Tried to destroy the growing socialist movement by the notorious "exceptional" law and win the workers away from socialism through a program of compulsory social insurance
- BOEHM-BAWERK, Eugen von (1851-1914), Austrian economist Claimed a "definitive refutation" of Marx and the "removal" of the problem of value from economic theory
- BOLTE, Friedrich, German Socialist, active member of the First International in America
- BRENTANO, LUJO (1844-1931) German economist of the "historical" School
- BURET, Antoine Eugène (1810-1842), French economist, disciple of Sismondi
- BURKE, Edmund (1729-1797), English statesman and pamphleteer, Whig, and following the French revolution, leading ideologist of reaction
- CAMPANELLO, Tommaso (1568-1639), Italian philosopher and author of *The City of the Sun*, a description of a utopian communist state

- CHAMBERLAIN, Joseph (1836-1914), English statesman and Manchester manufacturer Colonial Secretary 1895-1903 Father of Austen and Neville Chamberlain
- CHERNYSHEVSKY, Nikolai (1828-1889), Russian economist, materialist philosopher, literary critic, novelist, and revolutionary democrat His activities and writings, for which he spent twenty years in prison and exile, had great influence on the Russian revolutionary movement
- CHICHERIN, Boris (1828-1904), Russian nobleman, historian, professor of constitutional law in Moscow
- COBBETT, William (1763-1835), English peasant-born radical democrat, fiery advocate of parliamentary and social reform
- CONDILLAC, Abbot Etienne Bonnot de (1715-1780), French philosopher whose further development of Locke's theory of sensationalism influenced eighteenth-century French materialists
- COOPER, Thomas (1759-1839), American scientist, educator, and economist
- DANIELSON, Nikolai (pseudonym Nikolai —on (1844-1918), Russian economist, leading Narodnik (Populist) ideologist
- DEPREZ, Marcel (1843-1918), French physicist and mathematician
- DESTUTT DE TRACY, Count Antoine Louis Claude (1754-1836), French philosopher and economist, follower of Adam Smith and J. B. Say
- DIETZGEN, Joseph (1828-1888), German worker and self-taught philosopher, materialist, and Communist Lived in America after 1884
- DOUAI, Adolph (1819-1888), German democrat, participant in the Revolution of 1848-49 Came to America in 1852, where he was active as an Abolitionist and later as a Socialist Editor of the New York *Volkszeitung* and other German language papers
- DUEHRING, Eugen (1833-1921), German petty-bourgeois philosopher and economist, for a time lecturer at Berlin University Gained some influence among German Social-Democrats in the 1870's Exhaustively criticized by Engels in his *Herr Eugen Duehring's Revolution in Science (Anti-Duehring)*
- ENGELHARDT, Alexander (1832-1893), Russian landowner, agricultural chemist and Populist
- FLEROVSKY (pseudonym of Vasilii Bervi) (1829-1918), well known Russian Populist publicist
- FOURIER, François Marie Charles (1772-1837), French utopian socialist, savage critic of bourgeois society Advocated the founding of communist colonies known as *phalanstères* The founders of Brook Farm colony in Massachusetts were among his followers
- FRAAS, Karl Nikolaus (1810-1875), German botanist and agricultural scientist "A Darwinist before Darwin" (Marx)
- FREILIGRATH, Ferdinand (1810-1876), German poet Worked with

- Marx during the Revolution of 1848-49, but joined the petty-bourgeois democrats among the German émigrés in London in the 1850's
- FULLARTON, John (1780-1849), English banker and monetary theorist
- GARNIER, Marquis Germain (1754-1821), French economist, translator of Adam Smith's *Wealth of Nations* (1805)
- GLADSTONE, William Ewart (1809-1898), English statesman, four times prime minister. Leader of the Liberal Party in the second half of the nineteenth century
- GOETHE, Johann Wolfgang von (1749-1832), German poet and dramatist, one of the greatest figures in German literature and in the cultural development of his time
- GOLOVACHEV, Alexei (1819-1903), Russian writer and railroad figure. Took part in the preparatory work for the abolition of serfdom in 1861
- GRAY, John (1799-1850), One of a group of English economists who drew socialist conclusions from the labor theory of value developed by the classical school, especially by Ricardo. Although they grasped the socio-economic basis of capitalist exploitation, their approach to the "ideal society" was utopian
- GRIMM, Jacob Ludwig Karl (1785-1863), German philologist. Also known for his collection of fairy tales
- GUELICH, Gustav von (1791-1847), German economic historian
- HEGEL, Georg Wilhelm Friedrich (1770-1831), German idealist philosopher, whose great contribution was the development of the dialectic method. Hegel's idealism was in contradiction to his dialectic method and led him to the reactionary political position of supporting the Prussian feudal monarchy
- HODGSKIN, Thomas (1787-1869), English Ricardian socialist
- HUME, David (1711-1776), Scottish philosopher, historian, and economist. In philosophy Hume developed Locke's sensationalism further to the position of agnosticism and subjective idealism
- ILIENKOV, Pavel (1821-1876), Russian agricultural chemist, head of one of the largest Russian sugar factories
- KABLUKOV, Nikolai (1849-1919), Russian statistician, economist, Populist. Professor at Moscow University
- KAUFMAN, Alexander (1864-1919), Russian economist and statistician, specialist on problems of peasant migration
- KAUFMAN, Ilarion (1848-1916), Russian economist, specializing in statistics and finance
- KAUTSKY, Karl (1854-1938), German Social-Democrat and leading theoretician of the Second International. After Engels' death (1895) Kautsky led the fight against Eduard Bernstein's revisionism, although not without vacillations. Later himself became a revisionist and an open and violent enemy of the October Revolution in Russia

KOSHELEV, Alexander (1806-1883), Russian landowner and supporter of peasant reform and rural self-government

KOSTOMAROV, Nikolai (1817-1885), Russian historian, student of Ukrainian ethnography and history Favored local bourgeois national movements as a means of struggle against tsarist autocracy

KOVALEVSKY, Maxim (1851-1916), Russian social scientist and prominent bourgeois liberal

KUGELMANN, Ludwig (1830-1902), Hannover physician, member of the First International, personal friend of Marx

LAFARGUE, Paul (1842-1911), leader of the Marxist wing of the French labor movement and member of the General Council of the First International Married Marx's second daughter, Laura (1868) One of the founders of the French Workers' Party (1879)

LASSALLE, Ferdinand (1825-1864), German lawyer and labor leader Founded the first mass Workers' Party in Germany, the General Association of German Workers (1863) Criticized by Marx on theoretical grounds and for his dealings with Bismarck

LAVROV, Peter (1823-1900), distinguished Russian writer and publicist, exponent of Populism, member of the First International

LESSING, Gotthold Ephraim (1729-1781), German dramatist and critic, primitive materialist and uncompromising democrat Theoretician of eighteenth century bourgeois realism

LIEBIG, Justus von (1803-1873), German chemist, founder of German experimental and agricultural chemistry

LIEBKNECHT, Wilhelm (1826-1900), One of the founders and outstanding leaders of the German Social-Democratic Party Repeatedly elected to the Reichstag Father of Karl Liebknecht, one of the founders of the German Communist Party

LOCKE, John (1632-1704), English philosopher, writer on political and economic theory His "sensationalist" theory of knowledge influenced both later French materialism and English idealism

LONGUET, Charles (1833-1903), French journalist, Proudhonist Member of the General Council of the First International and of the Paris Commune Married Marx's oldest daughter, Jenny (1873)

LOPATIN, Hermann (1845-1918), Russian Populist, member of the General Council of the First International Imprisoned in the Schliessburg Fortress, 1887-1905

LORIA, Achille, born 1857, Italian economist, professor at Siena, Padua and Turin

MACLAREN, James (1782-1866), English economist, author of *A Sketch of the History of Currency* (1858)

MALTHUS, Thomas Robert (1766-1834), English clergyman and writer on economics, best known for his "law of population," based on notion that population grows more rapidly than food supply

MAURER, Georg Ludwig von (1790-1872), German jurist and historian

- McCULLOCH**, John Ramsay (1789-1864), Scottish economist, popularizer of Ricardo
- MEHRING**, Franz (1846-1919), German Social-Democrat, journalist, literary scholar, party historian and biographer of Marx One of the founders of the Spartacus League, forerunner of the German Communist Party
- MENDELEYEV**, Dmitrii (1834-1907), great Russian chemist Worked out the periodic table of elements
- MEYER**, Siegfried (1840-1872), German socialist, one of the founders of the American section of the First International
- MILL**, James (1773-1836), English economist, follower of Ricardo Father of John Stuart Mill
- MILL**, John Stuart (1806-1873), English philosopher and economist, whose adherence to the classical school was modified by a number of theoretical and political compromises in the face of the growth of the labor movement and of socialist criticism
- MONTEIL**, Amans Alexis (1769-1850), French historian who held that history should concern itself more with the people than with kings, statesmen, and generals
- MOORE**, Samuel (1830-1912), English businessman, student of natural science and law Known for his translation into English of *Capital*, Vol I, carried out under Engels' supervision
- MORE**, Sir Thomas (1478-1535), English statesman, humanist, author of *Utopia* (from Greek, meaning "no-place"), which described an ideal state where means of production and products were owned in common Hence considered the first utopian socialist
- MORTON**, John Chalmers (1821-1888), English economist, specialist in agriculture
- MOST**, Johann (1846-1906), German anarchist Began as a Social-Democrat, but was expelled from the party in 1880 Emigrated to the United States in 1882
- NIEWENHUIS**, DOMELA, Ferdinand (1846-1919), one of the founders of the Dutch Social-Democratic Party, later an anarchist
- ORTES**, Giannmaria (1713-1790), Italian monk, economist
- OWEN**, Robert (1771-1858), English cotton manufacturer and utopian socialist Originator of the co-operative movement Among the communist colonies founded by him was "New Harmony" in Indiana
- PATLAEVSKY**, Innokentii (1839-1883), Russian financial specialist
- PEEL**, Sir Robert (1788-1850), English statesman and factory owner, leader of the Conservative Party
- PETTY**, Sir William (1623-1687), English economist, forerunner of the classical school In his *Political Arithmetick* (1690) he not only pioneered in the application of statistics to economic studies, but wrote the first work in which "political economy is differentiated as an independent science" (Marx)
- PROUDHON**, Pierre Joseph (1809-1865), French economist and

political theorist, considered the father of French "mutualism" (reconciliation of classes) and syndicalism. Advocated free credit schemes

RAVENSTONE, Percy (died 1830), English writer on economics and social reform. Critic of Malthus' population theory and opponent of capitalist forms of property

RAZIN, Stepan (died 1671), Don Cossack, leader of a peasant war against tsarism. Executed in Moscow

RICARDO, David (1772-1823), English financier, member of Parliament, outstanding representative of classical political economy

RODBERTUS, Johann Karl (1805-1875), German landowner, economist. Emphasized the "iron law of wages" and the underconsumption theory of crises

ROSCHER, Wilhelm (1817-1894), German economist, founder of the so-called "historical" school of political economy

SAINT-SIMON, Count Claude Henri de (1760-1825), French utopian socialist. In his ideal society government, led by scientists and industrialists, was to be confined to the administration of production and to improving the lot of the "poorest and most numerous" class

SALTYKOV-SHCHEDRIN, Mikhail (1826-1889), Russian nobleman and writer. His satirical works were directed against the feudal nobility and the rising bourgeoisie

SAY, Jean Baptiste (1767-1832), French economist, popularizer of the work of Adam Smith. Say, however, abandoned the classical labor theory of values in favor of a subjective utility theory

SCHMIDT, Conrad (1863-1932), German economist, Social-Democrat, turned revisionist in the early 1900's

SCHMOLLER, Gustav (1838-1917), German economic historian and professor of political science

SCHOENBEIN, Christian Friedrich (1799-1868), German chemist, discoverer of ozone (1839) and gun cotton and collodion (1845)

SCHWEITZER, Johann Baptist von (1833-1875), German lawyer, founder of the Lassallean paper *Sozial-Demokrat* (1865), which was subsidized by Bismarck. Succeeded Lassalle as head of the General Association of German Workers

SENIOR, Nassau William (1790-1864), English economist who reacted to early socialist criticism of capitalism by modifying the labor theory of value and proposing the "abstinence" theory as a justification of capitalist profit

SERGEYEVICH, Vasilii (1835-1911), Russian historian of law, professor at St. Petersburg University. Conservative

SIEBER, Nikolai (1844-1888), Russian economist

SISMONDI, Jean Charles Leonard Simonde de (1773-1842), French historian and economist. Early Socialist critic of the classical school. Held that periodic crises were caused by continually expanding production and insufficient purchasing power



- SMITH, Adam (1723-1790), Scottish philosopher and economist, regarded as the founder of the classical school of political economy. Opponent of mercantilist national economic policies, advocate of *laissez-faire*. Spokesman for the rising industrial bourgeoisie.
- SOKOLOVSKY, Pavel, born 1842, Russian historian and economist, author of several works on the Russian agrarian population.
- SOMBART, Werner (1863-1941), German economist, prominent under the Empire, the Weimar Republic, and the fascist regime.
- SORGE, Friedrich Adolph (1828-1906), German Communist, fought in the German Revolution of 1848, after which he emigrated to America. Secretary General of the First International, 1872-1876, when the headquarters were in New York.
- THUENEN, Johann Heinrich von (1783-1850), German landowner and economist. Developed a theory of agricultural price and rent in relation to cost of transportation.
- TIMIRIAZEV, Klimentii (1843-1920), outstanding Russian scientist. Student and popularizer in Russia of Darwin's theories of evolution. His revolutionary political views led to his leaving the university (1911) and his whole-hearted acceptance of the October Revolution.
- TOOKE, Thomas (1774-1858), English economist, monetary theorist.
- TORRENS, Robert (1780-1864), English economist of the classical school, disciple of Ricardo.
- VASILCHIKOV, Prince Alexander (1818-1881), Russian landowner and publicist of liberal Populist tendencies. Active in the Russian co-operative movement.
- VOGT, Karl (1817-1895), German natural scientist, vulgar materialist. Exposed as an agent of Napoleon III by Marx in his book *Herr Vogt*.
- VORONTSOV, Vasilii (1847-1918), outstanding economist and publicist of the Russian Populist movement in the 1880's and 1890's, known under the pseudonym "V V". Extensively criticized by Lenin.
- WAGNER, Adolf (1835-1917), German economist, advocate of "state socialism," founder (1878) of the reactionary Christian Social Party.
- WAKEFIELD, Edward Gibbon (1796-1862), English writer on colonization, influential in the colonization of South Australia.
- WEYDEMEYER, Joseph (1818-1866), German artillery officer, member of the Communist League, participated in the Revolution of 1848. Emigrated to America in 1851. Fought as an officer in the Civil War on the side of the North. Active in the American labor movement.
- WOLFF, Wilhelm (1809-1864), German communist, member of the Central Committee of the Communist League, participant in the German Revolution of 1848-49. Lived in England after 1851. Close friend of Marx and Engels.

लाल बहादुर शास्त्री राष्ट्रीय प्रशासन अकादमी, पुस्तकालय  
Lal Bahadur Shastri National Academy of Administration Library

**मसूरी**  
**MUSSOORIE**

106302

यह पुस्तक निम्नांकित तारीख तक वापिस करनी है ।

**This book is to be returned on the date last stamped.**

[illegible]

335.4  
Leo

106302  
अवाप्ति संख्या  
Acc No. ~~11258~~

वग संख्या पुस्तक संख्या  
Class No. \_\_\_\_\_ Book No. \_\_\_\_\_  
लेखक

Author Leontiev, A.

शीर्षक

335.4  
Leo

~~11258~~

**LIBRARY**  
**LAL BAHADUR SHASTRI**  
**National Academy of Administration**  
**MUSSOORIE**

Accession No. 106302

1. Books are issued for 15 days only but may have to be recalled earlier if urgently required.
2. An over-due charge of 25 Paise per day per volume will be charged.
3. Books may be renewed on request, at the discretion of the Librarian.
4. Periodicals, Rare and Reference books may not be issued and may be consulted only in the Library.
5. Books lost, defaced or injured in any way shall have to be replaced or its double price shall be paid by the borrower.

Help to keep this book fresh, clean & moving